LABORATORY DATA CONSULTANTS, INC.
2701 Loker Ave. West, Suite 220, Carlsbad, CA 92010 Bus: 760-827-1100 Fax: 760-827-1099

Windward Environmental, LLC
200 West Mercer Street, Suite 401
Seattle, WA 98119
ATTN: Amara Vandervort
amarav@windwardenv.com

November 24, 2020

SUBJECT: Revised Duwamish AOC4, Data Validation

Dear Ms. Vandervort,

Enclosed are the revised validation reports for the fractions listed below. These SDGs were received on November 4, 2020. Attachment 1 is a summary of the samples that were reviewed for each analysis.

LDC Project #49590_RV1:

SDG #	Fraction
20I0181, 20I0192, 20I0211 20I0216, 20I0226, 20I0233 20I0239	Semivolatiles, Hexachlorobenzene, Polychlorinated Biphenyls, Metals, Wet Chemistry, Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

The data validation was performed under Stage 2B & 4 guidelines. The analyses were validated using the following documents, as applicable to each method:

- Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation; May 2020
- USEPA National Functional Guidelines for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review; January 2017
- USEPA National Functional Guidelines for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review; January 2017
- USEPA National Functional Guidelines for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review; April 2016
- EPA SW 846, Third Edition, Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, update 1, July 1992; update IIA, August 1993; update II, September 1994; update IIB, January 1995; update III, December 1996; update IIIA, April 1998; IIIB, November 2004; update IV, February 2007; update V, July 2014

Please feel free to contact us if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Pei Geng
pgeng@lab-data.com
Project Manager/Senior Chemist

780 pages-ADV 2 WEEK TAT Attachment 1

Stage 2B/4 (client Select) EDD

LDC #49590 (Windward Environmental, LLC - Seattle WA / Duwamish AOC4)

LDC	SDG#	DATE REC'D	(3) DATE DUE	SVOA (8270E)		SVOA (8270E -SIM)		(1) Pest (8081B)		PCBs (8082A)		Metals (6020A)		Metals (6020A-UCT-KED)		Hg (7471B)		Dioxins (1613B)		TOC (9060A)		Total Solids (2540G)													
Matrix: Water/Sediment				W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S	W	S
A	20I0181	11/04/20	11/18/20	0	7	0	4	0	2	0	20	0	2	0	2	0	3	0	5	0	20	0	20												
B	20I0192	11/04/20	11/18/20	0	2	0	2	-	-	0	19	-	-	0	2	0	1	0	6	0	20	0	20												
C	20I0211	11/04/20	11/18/20	0	2	-	-	-	-	0	20	-	-	-	-	0	4	0	6	0	20	0	20												
D	20I0216	11/04/20	11/18/20	0	1	0	4	0	1	0	19	0	1	0	3	0	3	-	-	0	19	0	19												
E	20I0226	11/04/20	11/18/20	-	-	0	14	-	-	0	6	-	-	0	1	-	-	0	3	0	7	0	8												
F	20I0233	11/04/20	11/18/20	-	-	0	8	-	-	0	18	-	-	0	3	-	-	0	6	0	18	0	18												
G	20I0239	11/04/20	11/18/20	0	1	0	4	-	-	0	14	0	3	0	4	0	3	0	4	0	15	0	15												
Total	J/PG			0	13	0	36	0	3	0	116	0	6	0	15	0	14	0	30	0	119	0	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472

Shaded cells indicate Stage 4 validation (all other cells are Stage 2B validation). These sample counts do not include MS/MSD, and DUPs

L:\Windward\Duwamish\49590ST.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS384	20I0181-01	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS384DL	20I0181-01DL	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS385	20I0181-02	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS384MS	20I0181-01MS	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS384MSD	20I0181-01MSD	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS267MS	20I0181-09MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS267MSD	20I0181-09MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/06/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	29.2	LDW20-SS384	J (all detects)	A
	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	23.7	LDW20-SS385	J (all detects)	
	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	37.2		J (all detects)	

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0046-BLK1	10/02/20	Benzofluoranthenes, total	11.7 ug/Kg	LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-SS229	Benzofluoranthenes, total	11.6 ug/Kg	11.6U ug/Kg

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS385	Nitrobenzene-d5 Terphenyl-d14	28.1 (30-120) 22.4 (37-120)	All compounds	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS384MS/MSD (LDW20-SS384 LDW20-SS384DL)	Naphthalene	-44.0 (43-120)	-42.7 (43-120)	J (all detects)	A
	2-Methylnaphthalene	11.6 (43-120)	13.4 (43-120)	J (all detects)	
	Acenaphthene	-14.8 (45-120)	-10.6 (45-120)	J (all detects)	
	Fluorene	-11.3 (45-120)	-6.82 (45-120)	J (all detects)	
	Anthracene	-54.3 (45-120)	-52.2 (45-120)	J (all detects)	
	Benzo(a)anthracene	-149 (49-120)	-151 (49-120)	J (all detects)	
	Chrysene	-180 (47-120)	-194 (47-120)	J (all detects)	
	Benzofluoranthenes, total	-76.1 (30-160)	-73.1 (30-160)	J (all detects)	
	Benzo(a)pyrene	-178 (42-120)	-174 (42-120)	J (all detects)	
	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	-77.1 (42-123)	-71.5 (42-123)	J (all detects)	
	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	-114 (38-126)	-117 (38-126)	J (all detects)	

For LDW20-SS384MS/MSD, no data were qualified for phenanthrene, fluoranthene, and pyrene percent recoveries (%R) outside the QC limits since the parent sample results were greater than 4X the spike concentration.

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID	Compound	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
BIJ0031-BS1	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	143 (42-123) 136 (30-133)	LDW20-SS384 LDW20-SS384DL LDW20-SS385	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

In the case where more than one result was reported for an individual sample, the least technically acceptable results were deemed not reportable as follows:

Sample	Compound	Reason	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS384	Phenanthrene Fluoranthene Pyrene	Results exceeded calibration range.	Not reportable	-
LDW20-SS384DL	All compounds except Phenanthrene Fluoranthene Pyrene	Results from undiluted analyses were more usable.	Not reportable	-

Due to continuing calibration %D, surrogate %R, MS/MSD %R, and LCS %R, data were qualified as estimated in two samples.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS384 LDW20-SS385	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SS385	All compounds	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Surrogates (%R)
LDW20-SS384	Naphthalene 2-Methylnaphthalene Acenaphthene Fluorene Anthracene Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzofluoranthenes, total Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-SS384 LDW20-SS385	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R)
LDW20-SS384	Phenanthrene Fluoranthene Pyrene	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data
LDW20-SS384DL	All compounds except Phenanthrene Fluoranthene Pyrene	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-SS229	Benzofluoranthenes, total	11.6U ug/Kg	A

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A2a

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/10/20

SDG #: 20I0181

Page: 1 of 1

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Reviewer: 2

2nd Reviewer: AC

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A / A	RSD≤20%. ICV=30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV≤20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	SW	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	SW	
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	SW / A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	A	
XIII.	Target compound identification	A	
XIV.	System performance	A	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	SW	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1 1	LDW20-SS384	20I0181-01	Sediment	06/29/20
2 1	LDW20-SS384DL	20I0181-01DL	Sediment	06/29/20
3 1	LDW20-SS385	20I0181-02	Sediment	06/29/20
4 2	LDW20-SS267 AAA	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
5 2	LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
6 3	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
7 3	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
8	LDW20-SS384MS	20I0181-01MS	Sediment	06/29/20
9	LDW20-SS384MSD	20I0181-01MSD	Sediment	06/29/20
10	LDW20-SS267MS	20I0181-09MS	Sediment	06/30/20
11	LDW20-SS267MSD	20I0181-09MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
12 3	LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
13 3	LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
14	BLJ0031. BLJ0109. BLJ0046			

LDC #: 49570A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: 9

Method: Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	✓			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?			✓	
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 30%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) within method criteria?		✓		
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks? If yes, please see the blanks validation findings worksheet.	✓			
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks were identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%R) within QC limits?	✓	✓		
If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?		✓		
If any percent recoveries (%R) was less than 10%, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R ?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?	✓			

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?		✓		
IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?		✓		
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			✓	
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% to +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XIII. Target compound identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	✓			
Did compound spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	✓			
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data	✓			
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.				

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1.Dibenz(a,h)+(a,c)anthracene
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1.Benzo(j)fluoranthene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1.Benzo(b)naphtho(2,1-d)thiophene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1.
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1.
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1.
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1.
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1.
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1.
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1.
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1.
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1.
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1.
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1.
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1.
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1.
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1.
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1.
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1.
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1.
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1.
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW. Chrysene/Triphenylene	W1.
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX.Benzo(j)+(k)fluoranthene	X1.
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. Naphthobenzophiophene	Y1.
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ.Benzofluoranthenes, Total	Z1.

LDC #: ~~46590A29~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y (N) N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/6/20	NT1020100504	HH	29.2		~~All~~ 1, 3, 8-9, MB (1 only)	√ HH / A
			~~KK~~	23.7			
			LLL	37.2			√

LDC #: 49390A-2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each concentration preparation level?
Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample?
Y N N/A Was the blank contaminated? If yes, please see qualification below.

Blank extraction date: 10/2/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/8/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: 6-7

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	BD0046-BK1	6								
ZZZZ	11.7		11.6/11							

Blank extraction date: _____ **Blank analysis date:** _____
Conc. units: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as the phthalates and TICs noted above that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 49590A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Surrogate Recovery

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualification below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y [✓ N] N/A Were percent recoveries (%R) for surrogates within QC limits?

Y [✓ N] N/A If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

Y ~~N~~ [✓ N/A] If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?

#	Date	Sample ID	Surrogate	%R (Limits)	Qualifications
		3 (dets+ND)	NBZ	28.1 (30-120)	J/UJ/P
			TPH	22.4 (35-120)	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	
				( )	

(NBZ) = Nitrobenzene-d5
(FBP) = 2-Fluorobiphenyl
(TPH) = Terphenyl-d14
(PHL) = Phenol-d5

(2FP)= 2-Fluorophenol
(TBP) = 2,4,6-Tribromophenol
(2CP) = 2-Chlorophenol-d4
(DCB) = 1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4

LDC #: ~~49576A29~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.

(Y) N N/A Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?

Y (N) N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	8/9	J	-44.0 (43-120)	-42.7 (43-120)	( )	1-2 (dup)	J/UJ/A
		W	11.6 (↓)	13.4 (↓)	( )		
		~~DD~~ ~~EE~~	-14.8 (45-120)	-10.6 (45-120)	( )		
		NN	-11.3 (↓)	-6.82 (↓)	( )		
		VV	-54.3 (45-120)	-52.2 (↓)	( )		
		CCC	-149 (49-120)	-151 (49-120)	( )		
		DDD	-180 (47-120)	-194 (47-120)	( )		
		ZZZ	-76.1 (30-160)	-73.1 (30-160)	( )		
		III	-178 (42-120)	-174 (42-120)	( )		
		~~HH~~	-77.1 (42-123)	-71.5 (42-123)	( )		↓
		~~KKK~~	61.9 (30-133)		( )		
		LLL	-114 (38-126)	-117 (38-126)	( )		J/UJ/A
		UU, YY, ZZ	%R out		( )		NQ > 4X
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		
					( )		

LDC #: 49592A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: q

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Was a LCS required?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the LCS/LCSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		BIJ0031-BS1	JJJ	143 (42-123)	( )	( )	1-3, 4B (dets)	J dets/P
			KKK	136 (30-133)	( )	( )		↓
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49590A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Overall Assessment of Data

Reviewer: a

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
All available information pertaining to the data were reviewed using professional judgement to compliment the determination of the overall quality of the data.

Y N N/A Was the overall quality and usability of the data acceptable?

#	Date	Sample ID	Compound	Finding	Qualifications
		1	UU, YY, ZZ > calib range		NR/A
		2	All except UU, YY, ZZ		↓

Comments: _____

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOC (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$
average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A_x = Area of compound,
C_x = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (5 std)	Recalculated RRF (5 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	9/19/20	Phenol (1st internal standard)	2.007806	2.007806	2.021015	2.021015	7.6	7.6
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)	1.056825	1.056825	1.037038	1.037038	2.8	2.8
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)	1.64294	1.64294	1.625994	1.625994	8.2	8.2
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)	1.091517	1.091517	1.054805	1.054805	2.6	2.6
			Chrysene (4th internal standard)	1.2920762	1.292076	1.24404	1.24404	2.7	2.7
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)	0.5831874	0.5831874	0.565477	0.565477	4.6	4.6
			Benzo(g,h,i) perylene (6th internal standard)	0.8346341	0.834634	0.8571136	0.8571136	5.1	5.1
	ICAL	10/13/20	Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)						
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)						
			Butylbenzylphthalate (5th internal standard)	0.5846178	0.5846178	0.5956702	0.5956702	7.8	7.8
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						
3			Phenol (1st internal standard)						
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)						
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)						
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)						
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOCs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = 100 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	NT1020100604	10/6/20	Phenol (1st internal standard)					
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)	1.037038	1.0535790	1.0535790	1.6	1.6
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)	1.625994	1.6146230	1.6146230	0.7	0.7
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)	1.054805	1.0672160	1.0672160	1.2	1.2
			Chrysene (4th internal standard)	1.24404	1.2519030	1.2519030	0.6	0.6
			Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (6th internal standard)	0.8571136	1.1721560	1.1721556	37.2	36.8
2	NT1020100802	10/8/20	Phenol (1st internal standard)	2.021015	2.0574620	2.0574620	1.8	1.8
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)	1.037038	1.0567110	1.0567106	1.9	1.9
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)	1.625994	1.5559960	1.5559960	4.3	4.3
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)	1.054805	1.0484750	1.0484746	0.6	0.6
			Chrysene (4th internal standard)	1.24404	1.2458130	1.2458129	0.1	0.1
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)	0.565477	0.5325410	0.5325410	5.8	5.8
			Benzo(g,h,i) perylene (6th internal standard)	0.8571136	0.8916706	0.8916705	4.3	4.0
	NT1020101314	10/13/20	2,4-Dimethylphenol(2nd internal standard)					
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)					
			Anthracene (4th internal standard)					
			Butylbenzylphthalate (5th internal standard)	0.5956702	0.5787982	0.5787982	2.8	2.8
			Benzo(g,h,i)perylene (6th internal standard)					

Comments: Refer to Continuing Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49390A29

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: SF/SS * 100

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: 6

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5	5.0	3.32192	66.4	66.4	
2-Fluorobiphenyl	↓	3.36334	67.3	67.3	
Terphenyl-d14	↓	3.21097	64.2	64.2	
Phenol-d5	7.5	2.71048	36.1	36.1	
2-Fluorophenol	↓	2.71477	36.2	36.2	
2,4,6-Tribromophenol	↓	4.48426	59.8	59.8	
2-Chlorophenol-d4	↓	3.60099	48.0	48.0	
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4	5.0	3.26771	65.4	65.4	

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

LDC #: 49910A29

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: VR

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentation

RPD = I MSC - MSC I * 2/(MSC + MSDC) MSC = Matrix spike concentration MSDC = Matrix spike duplicate concentration

MS/MSD samples: 12/13

Compound	Spike Added (µg/kg)		Sample Concentration (µg/kg)	Spiked Sample Concentration (µg/kg)		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	------	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol	500	500	ND	322	279	64.3	64.4	55.9	55.8	14.1	14.3
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine											
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol											
Acenaphthene	↓	↓	ND	425	425	85.1	85.0	85.1	85.0	0.01	0
Pentachlorophenol											
Pyrene	↓	↓	9.4	436	464	85.3	85.3	91.0	90.9	6.39	6.22

Comments: Refer to Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49390A20

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SC/SA) Where: SSC = Spike concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = I LCSC - LCSDC I * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboratory control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS/LCSD samples: BIJ0031-BS1

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Spike Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Phenol										
N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine										
4-Chloro-3-methylphenol										
Acenaphthene	500	NA	442	NA	88.3	88.4				
Pentachlorophenol										
Pyrene	500	↓	494	↓	98.9	98.8				

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: ~~49590A-9~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(V_t)(DF)(2.0)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(V_i)(\%S)}$

A_x	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured
A_{is}	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard
I_s	=	Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)
V_o	=	Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).
V_i	=	Volume of extract injected in microliters (ul)
V_t	=	Volume of the concentrated extract in microliters (ul)
Df	=	Dilution Factor.
%S	=	Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.
2.0	=	Factor of 2 to account for GPC cleanup

Example:

Sample I.D. 1, S:

Conc. = $\frac{(61354)(4.00)(1000)(1)(\quad)}{(36820)(1.03708)(25.99)(0.3847)(\quad)}$

= 643.1 ng/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ng/kg)	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification
	1	S	643		

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS410MS	20I0181-05MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS410MSD	20I0181-05MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/08/20 (NT10201008035)	Benzoic acid	28.9	All samples in SDG 20I0181	J (all detects)	A
10/08/20 (NT10201008035)	Pentachlorophenol	48.0	LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227	UJ (all non-detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS410 LDW20-SS412 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227	Benzoic acid	J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227	Pentachlorophenol	UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A2b

SDG #: 20I0181

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/10/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS ~~Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbon~~SVOAS (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A,A	RSD≤20% r^2 RR≤30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	AW	CCV≤20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	A	
XIII.	Target compound identification	A	
XIV.	System performance	A	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1 1	LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
2 1	LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
3 2	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
4 2	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
5 1	LDW20-SS410MS	20I0181-05MS	Sediment	06/30/20
6 1	LDW20-SS410MSD	20I0181-05MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
7 2	LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
8 2	LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
9				

Notes:

	BIJ0034						
	BIJ0046						

LDC #: 49370A2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Method: PAH (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check (Not required)				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	✓			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?	✓			
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤30%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?		✓		
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent differences (%R) within QC limits?	✓			
If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
If any percent recoveries (%R) was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			

LDC #: 41590A2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: 9

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			✓	
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% or +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XIII. Target compound identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	✓			
Did compound spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	✓			
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data	✓			
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1. Phenacetin
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1. Pronamide
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1. o,o',o''-Triethylphosphorothioate
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1. Triphenylene
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1. Famphur
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	W1. Methapyrilene
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	Z1. o-Toluidine

LDC #: 49590A-b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/8/20	NT1020100803	PPP	28.9		All (detect)	J (all detects) / A
			TT	48.0		3-4, T-8 LB (ND)	

CONCAL 2SD

Privileged and Confidential

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOC (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$
average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A_x = Area of compound,
C_x = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (1 std)	Recalculated RRF (1 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	9/19/20	1,4-Dichlorobenzene (1st internal standard)	1.494658	1.494658	1.492262	1.492262	3.2	3.2
			1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene (2nd internal standard)	0.3760281	0.376028	0.3735282	0.3735282	8.1	8.1
			N-Nitrosodiphenylamine (3rd internal standard)	0.5658487	0.565848	0.5488937	0.5488937	8.2	8.2
			(4th internal standard)						
			(5th internal standard)						
			(6th internal standard)						
2			Phenol (1st internal standard)						
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)						
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)						
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)						
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						
3			Phenol (1st internal standard)						
			Naphthalene (2nd internal standard)						
			Fluorene (3rd internal standard)						
			Phenanthrene (4th internal standard)						
			Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate (5th internal standard)						
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)						

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

Validation Findings Worksheet
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Method: GC/MS SVOCs

Date	Instrument	Compound	Level	(Y) Response	(X) Conc.	(X^2) Conc.
9/19/2020	NT10	Benzoic acid	1	0.025981668	0.040	0.20
			2	0.08441409	0.080	0.50
			3	0.200064642	0.200	1.00
			4	0.554953679	0.600	2.50
			5	1.287723759	1.000	5.00
			6	2.456586038	8.000	10.00

Regression Output

			Reported
Constant	c =	0.0000	0
Std Err of Y Est			
R Squared		0.9986483	0.9974
Degrees of Freedom			
	B =	A =	B=
X Coefficient(s)	-4.79584E-03	2.4940E-01	4.09527
Std Err of Coef.			A=
			-0.01884
Correlation Coefficient		0.999324	
Coefficient of Determination (r^2)	r^ 2	0.998648	1

LDC #: 49282A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC/MS SVOCs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = 100 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	HSL0904	9/4/20	1,4-Dichlorobenzene (1st internal standard)	1.492262	1.5199060	1.519906	1.9	1.9
			1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene (2nd internal standard)	0.3735282	0.3838269	0.3838268	2.8	2.8
			N-Nitrosodiphenylamine (3rd internal standard)	0.5488937	0.5664933	0.5664932	3.2	3.2
			(4th internal standard)					
			(5th internal standard)					
			(6th internal standard)					
2			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			e (3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
			(5th internal standard)					
			(6th internal standard)					
3			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			e (3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
			(5th internal standard)					
			(6th internal standard)					

Comments: Refer to Continuing Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: ~~49590A3b~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: SF/SS * 100

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: 3

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14	5.0	4.0379	80.8	80.8	
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol	7.5	2.6417	35.5	35.5	
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

Sample ID:

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					
Phenol-d5					
2-Fluorophenol					
2,4,6-Tribromophenol					
2-Chlorophenol-d4					
1,2-Dichlorobenzene-d4					

LDC #: 49590A2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: a

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentation

RPD = I MSC - MSC I * 2/(MSC + MSDC) MSC = Matrix spike concentration MSDC = Matrix spike duplicate concentration

MS/MSD samples: 7/8

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Concentration (ug/kg)	Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	------	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Acenaphthene											
Pyrene											
J	500	500	ND	588	581	118	118	116	116	1.29	1.20
TT	1300	1300	↓	911	969	70.1	70.1	74.6	74.6	6.19	6.17

Comments: Refer to Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49090A-b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SC/SA) Where: SSC = Spike concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = | LCSC - LCSDC | * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboratory control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS/LCSD samples: BIJ0046BS2

Compound	Spike Added (µg/kg)		Spike Concentration (µg/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Acenaphthene										
Pyrene										
J	500	NA	601	NA	120	120				
TT	1300	↓	952	↓	73.3	73.2				

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: [illegible]

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(V_t)(DF)(2.0)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(V_i)(\%S)}$

A_x	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured
A_{is}	=	Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard
I_s	=	Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)
V_o	=	Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).
V_i	=	Volume of extract injected in microliters (ul)
V_t	=	Volume of the concentrated extract in microliters (ul)
Df	=	Dilution Factor.
%S	=	Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.
2.0	=	Factor of 2 to account for GPC cleanup

Example:

Sample I.D. 1, PPP:

Conc. = $\frac{\left[\left(\frac{2439}{388162}\right)(4.0957)\right] - \left[(0.001884)\left(\frac{2439}{388162}\right)^2\right](4)(1000)}{(\quad)(15.95)(0.670)(\quad)(\quad)}$

= 104.4 ng/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ng/kg)	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification
	1	PPP	104		

LDC Report# 49590A3a

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Hexachlorobenzene

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Hexachlorobenzene by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8081B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at 12 hour intervals.

The individual 4,4'-DDT and Endrin breakdowns (%BD) were less than or equal to 15.0%.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0%.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations met validation criteria.

XII. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications met validation criteria.

XIII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A3a

SDG #: 20I0181

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/10/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [signature]

2nd Reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: GC Hexachlorobenzene (EPA SW846 Method 8081B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC Instrument Performance Check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A / A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes / ~~MS~~	A / A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	A	
XII.	Target compound identification	A	
XIII.	System Performance	A	
XIV	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
2	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
3	LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
4	LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

LDC #: 49590A31 **VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST** Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: 9

Method: Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081A)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
II. GC/ECD Instrument performance check				
Was the instrument performance found to be acceptable?	✓			
Were Evaluation mix standards analyzed prior to the initial calibration and at beginning of each 12-hour shift?	✓			
Were endrin and 4,4'-DDT breakdowns ≤ 15% for individual breakdown in the Evaluation mix standards?			✓	
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?			✓	
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
IIIb. Initial calibration verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VII. ***Surrogate spikes/Internal Standards***				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%R) within the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
If any percent recovery (%R) was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
Were internal standard area counts within ± 50% of the average area calculated during calibration?	✓			
VII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG?	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			✓	
XI. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions, dry weight factors, and clean-up activities applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
Were relative percent difference (RPD) of the results between two columns ≤ 40%?	✓			
XII. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 19598A2M

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081A)

The calibration factors (CF) and relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated using the following calculations:

CF = A/C
Average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

Where: A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound
S = Standard deviation of calibration factors
X = Mean of calibration factors

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (10 std)	Recalculated CF (10 std)	Reported Ave CF (initial)	Recalculated Ave CF (intial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	8/7/20	FF (STX-CLP)	1.167079	1.160178	1.239809	1.239809	9.2	9.2
			FF (1 ↓ 2)	1.151212	1.151212	1.238397	1.238397	10.5	10.5
2									
3									
4									

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590A2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081B)

Percent difference (%D) = 100 * (N - C)/N

Where: N = Initial Calibration Factor or Nominal Amount (ng)
C = Calibration Factor from Continuing Calibration Standard or Calculated Amount (ng)

Standard ID	Calibration Date/Time	Compound	Average CF/ CCV Conc	Reported CF/Conc CCV	Recalculated CF/Conc CCV	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
20100602	10/8/20	FF (STX-CAP)	1.239809	1.1155360	1.1155356	10.0	10.0
		FF ↓ 2	1.23839T	1.1091820	1.1091816	10.5	10.4

Comments: Refer to Continuing Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590A3a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081~~B~~A)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: SF/SS * 100

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: 1

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene	1C	40.0	23.16	57.9	57.9	
Decachlorobiphenyl	↓	↓	34.24	85.6	85.6	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene	2C		22.91	57.3	57.3	
Decachlorobiphenyl	↓	↓	34.10	85.2	85.2	

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Sample ID:

Surrogate	Column	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						
Tetrachloro-m-xylene						
Decachlorobiphenyl						

Notes:

LDC #: 49590A39

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081B)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent difference (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100* (SSC-SC)/SA

Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration; SA = Spike added; SC = Concentration

RPD = | SSCMS - SSCMSD | * 2/(SSCMS + SSCMSD)

MS = Matrix spike percent recovery; MSD = Matrix spike duplicate percent recovery

MS/MSD samples: 3/4

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Sample Concentration (ug/kg)	Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	--	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalculated
gamma-BHC											
4,4'-DDT											
Aroclor 1260											
FF	4.00	4.00	ND	2.88	2.47	72.0	72.0	61.8	61.8	15.4	15.3

Comments: Refer ot Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590A30

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081~~A~~)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100* (SSC-SC)/SA

Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added
SC = Concentration

RPD = | LCS - LCSD | * 2/(LCS + LCSD)

LCS = Laboratory control sample percent recovery

LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS/LCSD samples: BLJ0022-BS1

Compound	Spike Added (ug/L)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
gamma-BHC										
4,4'-DDT										
FF	4.00	NA	2.61	NA	65.3	65.3				

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 43904A24

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q

METHOD: GC Pesticides (EPA SW 846 Method 8081~~B~~)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(V_t)(DF)(2.0)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(V_i)(\%S)}$

A_x = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured

A_{is} = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard

I_s = Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)

V_o = Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).

V_i = Volume of extract injected in microliters (ul)

V_t = Volume of the concentrated extract in microliters (ul)

Df = Dilution Factor.

%S = Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.

2.0 = Factor of 2 to account for GPC cleanup

Example:

Sample I.D. NO, FF:
BIJ0022-BS1

Conc. = $\frac{(17294)(80.0)(2.5)(1)(\quad)}{(85429)(1.39809)(2.5)(\quad)(\quad)}$

= 2.61 ug/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ug/kg)	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification
	BIJ0022-BS1	FF	2.61		

LDC Report# 49590A3b

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS129	20I0181-04	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS414	20I0181-06	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS402	20I0181-08	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS221	20I0181-15	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS157	20I0181-16	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS153	20I0181-17	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS147	20I0181-18	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS147DL	20I0181-18DL	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS143	20I0181-19	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS143DL	20I0181-19DL	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS134	20I0181-20	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS414MS	20I0181-06MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS414MSD	20I0181-06MSD	Sediment	06/30/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
09/03/20	SII0059-SCV1	2C	Aroclor-1260	21.5	LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS129 LDW20-SS410 LDW20-SS414 LDW20-SS412 LDW20-SS402 LDW20-SS267 LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227 LDW20-SS221 LDW20-SS157 LDW20-SS153 LDW20-SS134	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/08/20	20100753ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1260	20.6	LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227 LDW20-SS221 LDW20-SS157 LDW20-SS153 LDW20-SS134	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Column	Internal Standards	%R (Limits)	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS147	1C	Hexabromobiphenyl	41 (50-200)	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS143	1C	Hexabromobiphenyl	42 (50-200)	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

The sample results for detected compounds from the two columns were within 40% relative percent difference (RPD) with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS410	Aroclor-1248	51.4	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS134	Aroclor-1254	43.4	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS147	Aroclor-1248	62.9	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS143	Aroclor-1248	83	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS143DL	Aroclor-1254	54.8	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

In the case where more than one result was reported for an individual sample, the least technically acceptable results were deemed not reportable as follows:

Sample	Compound	Reason	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS147 LDW20-SS143	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Matrix interference.	Not reportable	-
LDW20-SS147DL LDW20-SS143DL	All compounds except Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Results from undiluted analyses were more usable.	Not reportable	-

Due to ICV %D, continuing calibration %D, and RPD between two columns, data were qualified as estimated in nineteen samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS129 LDW20-SS410 LDW20-SS414 LDW20-SS412 LDW20-SS402 LDW20-SS267 LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227 LDW20-SS221 LDW20-SS157 LDW20-SS153 LDW20-SS134	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Initial calibration verification (%D)
LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227 LDW20-SS221 LDW20-SS157 LDW20-SS153 LDW20-SS134	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SS410 LDW20-SS147 LDW20-SS143	Aroclor-1248	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)
LDW20-SS134 LDW20-SS143DL	Aroclor-1254	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)
LDW20-SS147 LDW20-SS143	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data
LDW20-SS147DL LDW20-SS143DL	All compounds except Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A3b

SDG #: 20I0181

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: 9

2nd Reviewer: M

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A SW	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
III.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes /IS	A /SW	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	SW N	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII	Overall assessment of data	SW	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
2	LDW20-SS129	20I0181-04	Sediment	06/30/20
3	LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
4	LDW20-SS414	20I0181-06	Sediment	06/30/20
5	LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
6	LDW20-SS402	20I0181-08	Sediment	06/30/20
7	LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
8	LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
9	LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
10	LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
11	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
12	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
13	LDW20-SS221	20I0181-15	Sediment	06/30/20
14	LDW20-SS157	20I0181-16	Sediment	06/30/20
15	LDW20-SS153	20I0181-17	Sediment	06/30/20
16	LDW20-SS147	20I0181-18	Sediment	06/30/20
17	LDW20-SS147DL	20I0181-18DL	Sediment	06/30/20

LDC #: 49590A3b

SDG #: 20I0181

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 2 of 2

Reviewer: CP

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

18	LDW20-SS143	20I0181-19	Sediment	06/30/20
19	LDW20-SS143DL	20I0181-19DL	Sediment	06/30/20
20	LDW20-SS134	20I0181-20	Sediment	06/30/20
21	LDW20-SS414MS	20I0181-06MS	Sediment	06/30/20
22	LDW20-SS414MSD	20I0181-06MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
23				
24				
25				

Notes:

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590A5b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: _____
2nd Reviewer: _____

METHOD: / GC __ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of initial calibration verification calculation was performed? __%D or __%R
(Y) N N/A Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each ICAL for each instrument?
Y (N) N/A Did the initial calibration verification standards meet the %D / %R validation criteria of ≤20.0% / 80-120%?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit ≤ 20.0)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	9/2/20	SII0059SCV1	2C	BB	21.5	1-15.20.21-22.MB	J/UN/D

ICV-gc.wpd

LDC #: 49570A3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q
2nd Reviewer: ______

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?

Y [✓ N] N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D validation criteria of <20.0%?

Level IV Only

Y N [✓ N/A] Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/8/20	20100753ECD7	1C	BB	20.6	( )	9-15.20	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 19690A36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: LC/MS Perchlorate

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Were all internal standard area counts within -50 to +100 of the associated calibration standard?

(Y) N N/A Were the retention times of the internal standards within +/- 30 seconds of the retention times of the associated calibration standard?

#	Date	Sample ID	Internal Standard	70R Area (Limits)	RT (Limits)	Qualifications
		16 (BB)	HBP	41 (50-200)		J/UJ/A (all det)
		18 (EB)	HBP	42		

Hexabromobiphenyl

LDC #: ~~19590A3D~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Level IV/D Only

Y N ~~N/A~~ Were CRQLs adjusted for sample dilutions, dry weight factors, etc.?
Y N N/A Did the reported results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results?
Y N N/A Did the relative percent differences of detected compounds between two columns/detectors ≤40%?
If no, please see findings bellow.

#	Compound Name	Sample ID	%RPD Between Two Columns/Detectors Limit (≤ 40%)	Qualifications
	Z	3	51.4	~~Note~~ / A
	~~AA~~	20	43.4	
	Z	16	62.9	
	Z	18	83	
	~~AA~~	19	54.8	

LDC #: 47590A36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Overall Assessment of Data

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: √ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

All available information pertaining to the data were reviewed using professional judgement to compliment the determination of the overall quality of the data.

(Y) N N/A Was the overall quality and usability of the data acceptable?

#	Compound Name	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	16, 18	AA, BB (matrix interference)		NR/A
				↓
	17, ~~20~~ 19	All except AA, BB		

Comments: _____

OVRNew.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Metals

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS303MS	20I0181-03MS	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS303MSD	20I0181-03MSD	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS303DUP	20I0181-03DUP	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229DUP	20I0181-13DUP	Sediment	06/30/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Arsenic, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Silver, and Zinc by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A
Mercury by EPA SW 846 Method 7471B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Total Days From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Required Holding Time (in Days) From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS303DUP	Mercury	85	28	J (all detects)	P
LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227	Mercury	84	28	J (all detects)	P

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the methods.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS229MS/MSD (LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS229DUP)	Chromium	72.8 (75-125)	-	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS303MS/MSD (LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS303DUP)	Mercury	6.28 (75-125)	3.94 (75-125)	J (all detects)	A

For LDW20-SS303MS/MSD, although the percent recoveries were severely low for mercury, the associated sample results were qualified as estimated (J/UJ) since the post spike recoveries were within the QC limits for this analyte.

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

DUP ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	RPD (Limits)	Difference (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS229MS/MSD (LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS229DUP)	Chromium Lead	22.5 (≤20) 25.6 (≤20)	- -	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS303MS/MSD (LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS303DUP)	Mercury	-	0.4778 mg/Kg (≤0.0908)	J (all detects)	A

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to technical holding time, MS/MSD %R, and DUP RPD and difference, data were qualified as estimated in five samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS227 LDW20-SS303DUP	Mercury	J (all detects)	P	Technical holding times
LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS229DUP	Chromium	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS303DUP	Mercury	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-SS229 LDW20-SS229DUP	Chromium Lead	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Duplicate sample analysis (RPD)
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS303DUP	Mercury	J (all detects)	A	Duplicate sample analysis (difference)

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A4a

SDG #: 20I0181

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A/7471B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A SW	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	SW	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	SW	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	N	not reviewed
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	N	
XIV	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
2	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
3	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
4	LDW20-SS303MS	20I0181-03MS	Sediment	06/29/20
5	LDW20-SS303MSD	20I0181-03MSD	Sediment	06/29/20
6	LDW20-SS303DUP	20I0181-03DUP	Sediment	06/29/20
7	LDW20-SS229MS	20I0181-13MS	Sediment	06/30/20
8	LDW20-SS229MSD	20I0181-13MSD	Sediment	06/30/20
9	LDW20-SS229DUP	20I0181-13DUP	Sediment	06/30/20
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
2, 3	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn, Hg
1	Hg
QC:	
4 to 6	Hg
7 to 9	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn

Analysis Method

ICP	
ICP-MS	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn
CVAA	Hg

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)
All samples were properly preserved (water samples to a pH of <2) and analyzed within the required holding time with the following exceptions.

Method:		Mercury by 7471B, HT = 28 days			
Sample ID	Sampling Date	Analysis Date	Total Time from Collection to Analysis (Days)	Qualifier	Det/ND
6, 1	6/29/2020	9/22/2020	85	J/R/P	Det
2, 3	6/30/2020	9/22/2020	84	J/R/P	Det

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEETS
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

MS/MSD analysis was performed by the laboratory. All MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPDs) were within the acceptable limits with the following exceptions:

MS/MSD ID	Matrix	Analyte	MS %R	MSD %R	%R Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	Associated Samples	Qualification	Det/ND
7, 8	s	Cr	72.8		75-125			9, 2	J/UJ/A	Det
4, 5	s	Hg	6.28	3.94	75-125			6, 1	J/UJ/A	Det
									(PS = 98.3%)	

Comments:

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

Laboratory duplicate analysis was performed by the laboratory. All laboratory duplicates were with the relative percent difference (RPD) for samples >5X the reporting limits with the exceptions listed below. If samples were <5X the reporting limits, the difference was within 1X the reporting limit for water samples and within 2X the reporting limit for soil samples for all samples with the exceptions listed below.

Duplicate ID	Matrix	Analyte	RPD	RPD Limit	Difference (mg/Kg)	Difference Limit	Associated Samples	Qualification	Det/ND
9	s	Cr	22.5	20			9, 2	J/UJ/A	Det
		Pb	25.6	20			9, 2	J/UJ/A	Det
							)		
6	s	Hg			0.4778	0.0908	6, 1	J/UJ/A	Det

Comments:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS384	20I0181-01	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS385	20I0181-02	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS129	20I0181-04	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS414	20I0181-06	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS402	20I0181-08	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS221	20I0181-15	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS157	20I0181-16	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS153	20I0181-17	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS147	20I0181-18	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS143	20I0181-19	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS134	20I0181-20	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS384MS	20I0181-01MS	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS384DUP	20I0181-01DUP	Sediment	06/29/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0181 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/SW	A
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS384	20I0181-01	Sediment	06/29/20
2	LDW20-SS385	20I0181-02	Sediment	06/29/20
3	LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
4	LDW20-SS129	20I0181-04	Sediment	06/30/20
5	LDW20-SS410	20I0181-05	Sediment	06/30/20
6	LDW20-SS414	20I0181-06	Sediment	06/30/20
7	LDW20-SS412	20I0181-07	Sediment	06/30/20
8	LDW20-SS402	20I0181-08	Sediment	06/30/20
9	LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
10	LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
11	LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
12	LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
13	LDW20-SS229	20I0181-13	Sediment	06/30/20
14	LDW20-SS227	20I0181-14	Sediment	06/30/20
15	LDW20-SS221	20I0181-15	Sediment	06/30/20
16	LDW20-SS157	20I0181-16	Sediment	06/30/20
17	LDW20-SS153	20I0181-17	Sediment	06/30/20

LDC #: 49590A6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0181 Stage 2B Page: 2 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-SS147	20I0181-18	Sediment	06/30/20
19	LDW20-SS143	20I0181-19	Sediment	06/30/20
20	LDW20-SS134	20I0181-20	Sediment	06/30/20
21	LDW20-SS384MS	20I0181-01MS	Sediment	06/29/20
22	LDW20-SS384DUP	20I0181-01DUP	Sediment	06/29/20
23				
24				
25				

Notes:

Sample Specific Element Reference

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 20	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
21	TOC
22	Total solids, TOC

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0181

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
LDW20-SS303DUP	20I0181-03DUP	Sediment	06/29/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/16/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	59.7 ng/mL (45-56) 57.9 ng/mL (45-56) 59.9 ng/mL (45-55) 60.1 ng/mL (43-58)	All samples in SDG 20I0181	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0143-BLK1	10/08/20	OCDD	0.486 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0181

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates/Duplicate Sample Analysis

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0181	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A
All samples in SDG 20I0181	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A
LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS256	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration, compounds reported as EMPC, and CDPE interference, data were qualified as estimated in six samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS267 LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS303DUP	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS267 LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS303DUP	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS303 LDW20-SS267 LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS259 LDW20-SS256 LDW20-SS303DUP	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS260 LDW20-SS256	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (CDPE interference)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0181

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590A21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/9/20
SDG #: 20I0181 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: 1
2nd Reviewer: 2

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20/35%. ICV ≤ QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates /Dup	N/A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System performance	N	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS303	20I0181-03	Sediment	06/29/20
2	LDW20-SS267	20I0181-09	Sediment	06/30/20
3	LDW20-SS260	20I0181-10	Sediment	06/30/20
4	LDW20-SS259	20I0181-11	Sediment	06/30/20
5	LDW20-SS256	20I0181-12	Sediment	06/30/20
6	LDW20-SS303DUP	20I0181-03DUP	Sediment	06/29/20
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

	B+J 0143						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: ~~49590A21~~ 49590A21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?

Y (N) N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?

(Y) N N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) ~~Finding %D~~	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/16/20	20101609A	K	59.7 (45-56)		All (dets)	J/UJ/P
			N	57.9 (↓)			
			O	59.9 (45-55)			
			P	60.1 (43-58			↓
							~~dets = X~~

V:\VALIDATION WORKSHEETS\DIOXINS\1613\CONCAL.DOCX

VALIDATION FINDINGS WOR/UHEET
Blanks

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/8/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/16/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0143-BLK1	5X											
G	0.486	2.43											

LDC #: 49570A2/

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: PG

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N (N/A) Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N (N/A) Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		~~All~~	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
		3, 5	All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl either interference		Jdets/A

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

LDC Report# 49590B2a

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS380	20I0192-19	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS380MS	20I0192-19MS	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS380MSD	20I0192-19MSD	Sediment	06/26/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/06/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	29.2 23.7 37.2	All samples in SDG 20I0192	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS380MS/MSD (LDW20-SS380)	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	135 (42-123) -	142 (42-123) 137 (30-133)	NA	-
LDW20-SS380MS/MSD (LDW20-SS380)	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	-	136 (38-126)	J (all detects)	A

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID	Compound	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
BII0789-BS1	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	132 (42-123)	LDW20-SS380	NA	-
BII0789-BS1	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	132 (42-123)	LDW20-SC153B	J (all detects)	P

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, MS/MSD %R, and LCS %R, data were qualified as estimated in two samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS380 LDW20-SC153B	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SS380	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-SC153B	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	J (all detects)	P	Laboratory control samples (%R)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590B2a

SDG #: 20I0192

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/3/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: CV

2nd Reviewer: AC

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	N/N	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	N/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS380	20I0192-19	Sediment	06/26/20
2	LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
3	LDW20-SS380MS	20I0192-19MS	Sediment	06/26/20
4	LDW20-SS380MSD	20I0192-19MSD	Sediment	06/26/20
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	BI F0789						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	GGGG. C30-Hopane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	DD. Acenaphthylene	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
C. 2-Chlorophenol	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	K1. o,o',o''-Triethylphosphorothioate
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	KKKK. Atrazine	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
G. 2-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	MMMM. Caprolactam	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	JJ. Dibenzofuran	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
I. 4-Methylphenol	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	LL. Diethylphthalate	NNN. Aniline	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
K. Hexachloroethane	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	S1. Triphenylene
L. Nitrobenzene	NN. Fluorene	PPP. Benzoic Acid	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
M. Isophorone	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	U1. Famphur
N. 2-Nitrophenol	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	RRR. Pyridine	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	SSS. Benzidine	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	W1. Methapyrilene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	TT. Pentachlorophenol	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	Z1. o-Toluidine
S. Naphthalene	UU. Phenanthrene	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	A2. 1-Naphthylamine
T. 4-Chloroaniline	VV. Anthracene	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	B2. 4-Aminobiphenyl
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	WW. Carbazole	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine	C2. 4-Nitroquinoline-1-oxide
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	ZZZ. Perylene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine	D2. Hexachloropene
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	YY. Fluoranthene	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine	E2. Bis (2-chloro-1-methylethyl) ether
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ZZ. Pyrene	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine	F2. Bifenthrin
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	G2. Cyfluthrin
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	F1. Phenacetin	H2. Cypermethrin
AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	EEEE. 1,1'-Biphenyl	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene	I2. Permethrin (cis/trans)
BB. 2-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	FFFF. Retene	H1. Pronamide	J2. 5-Nitro-o-toluidine

LDC #: 49596B21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 4
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y (N) N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/4/20	NT1020100604	JJJ	29.2		All (dets + ND)	J (all) A
			KKK	23.7			
			LLL	37.2			

LDC #: 19590B2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.

[✓ Y] N N/A Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	3/4	NN	135 (42-123)	142 (42-123)	( )	1 (ND)	Jdets/A
		KKK	( )	137 (30-133)	( )	↓	↓
		LLL	( )	136 (38-126)	( )	(dets)	↓
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49590B29

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~ ______

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Was a LCS required?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the LCS/LCSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		BII0789-BS1	NN	132 (42-123)	( )	( )	All (dets = 2)	J dets/A
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/06/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	30.4 30.2	All samples in SDG 20I0192	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0800-BLK1	09/30/20	Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	1.10 ug/Kg 1.11 ug/Kg 2.07 ug/Kg 2.02 ug/Kg 2.09 ug/Kg 4.91 ug/Kg 4.56 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0192

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, data were qualified as estimated in two samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT112 LDW20-IT120	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590B2b
SDG #: 20I0192
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 10/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q
2nd Reviewer: K

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20% or r² ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
2	LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	BII0800						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	GGGG. C30-Hopane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	DD. Acenaphthylene	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
C. 2-Chlorophenol	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	K1. o,o',o"-Triethylphosphorothioate
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	GG. Acenaphthene	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	KKKK. Atrazine	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
G. 2-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	MMMM. Caprolactam	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	JJ. Dibenzofuran	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
I. 4-Methylphenol	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	LL. Diethylphthalate	NNN. Aniline	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
K. Hexachloroethane	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	S1. Triphenylene
L. Nitrobenzene	NN. Fluorene	PPP. Benzoic Acid	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
M. Isophorone	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	U1. Famphur
N. 2-Nitrophenol	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	RRR. Pyridine	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	SSS. Benzidine	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	W1. Methapyrilene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	TT. Pentachlorophenol	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	Z1. o-Toluidine
S. Naphthalene	UU. Phenanthrene	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	A2. 1-Naphthylamine
T. 4-Chloroaniline	VV. Anthracene	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	B2. 4-Aminobiphenyl
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	WW. Carbazole	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine	C2. 4-Nitroquinoline-1-oxide
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	ZZZ. Perylene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine	D2. Hexachloropene
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	YY. Fluoranthene	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine	E2. Bis (2-chloro-1-methylethyl) ether
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	ZZ. Pyrene	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine	F2. Bifenthrin
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine	G2. Cyfluthrin
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	F1. Phenacetin	H2. Cypermethrin
AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	EEEE. 1,1'-Biphenyl	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene	I2. Permethrin (cis/trans)
BB. 2-Nitroaniline	DDD. Chrysene	FFFF. Retene	H1. Pronamide	J2. 5-Nitro-o-toluidine

LDC #: 49590B26

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: <20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/6/20	NT8201004	HH	30.4		All (detects)	J (HH) / A
			kkk	30.2			J (kkk) / A

LDC #: 49590

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each concentration preparation level?
Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample?
Y N N/A Was the blank contaminated? If yes, please see qualification below.

Blank extraction date: 9/30/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/6/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
BIJ	0800-BK1									
CCC	1.10									
DDD	1.11									
EEE	2.07									
HHH	2.02									
III	2.09									
JJJ	4.91									
KKK	4.56									

Blank extraction date: _____ **Blank analysis date:** _____
Conc. units: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as the phthalates and TICs noted above that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS313	20I0192-03	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS317	20I0192-04	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS205	20I0192-05	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS209	20I0192-06	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS213	20I0192-07	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC136	20I0192-12	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC131	20I0192-13	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC132	20I0192-14	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC141	20I0192-15	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS131	20I0192-16	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS132	20I0192-17	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS420	20I0192-18	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SC157A	20I0192-23	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS420MS	20I0192-18MS	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS420MSD	20I0192-18MSD	Sediment	06/26/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
09/03/20	SII0059-SCV1	2C	Aroclor-1260	21.5	LDW20-SS311 LDW20-SS313 LDW20-SS317 LDW20-SS205 LDW20-SS209 LDW20-SS213 LDW20-IT112 LDW20-IT120 LDW20-SC136 LDW20-SC131 LDW20-SC141 LDW20-SS131 LDW20-SS132 LDW20-SS420 LDW20-SC153B LDW20-SC157A	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/09/20	20100847ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1260	26.4	LDW20-SC141 LDW20-SS131 LDW20-SS132 LDW20-SS420 LDW20-SC153B LDW20-SC157A	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. Surrogate recoveries (%R) were not within QC limits for sample LDW20-IT303. No data were qualified for samples analyzed at greater than or equal to 5X dilution.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

The sample results for detected compounds from the two columns were within 40% relative percent difference (RPD) with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS205	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	41.8 45.5	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS213	Aroclor-1260	43.6	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to ICV %D, continuing calibration %D, and RPD between two columns, data were qualified as estimated in sixteen samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS311 LDW20-SS313 LDW20-SS317 LDW20-SS205 LDW20-SS209 LDW20-SS213 LDW20-IT112 LDW20-IT120 LDW20-SC136 LDW20-SC131 LDW20-SC141 LDW20-SS131 LDW20-SS132 LDW20-SS420 LDW20-SC153B LDW20-SC157A	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Initial calibration verification (%D)
LDW20-SC141 LDW20-SS131 LDW20-SS132 LDW20-SS420 LDW20-SC153B LDW20-SC157A	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SS205	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)
LDW20-SS213	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590B3b

SDG #: 20I0192

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/SW	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
III.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes / IS	SW/A	%R out for #8. NQ ≥ 5x of
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	SW N	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
2	LDW20-SS313	20I0192-03	Sediment	06/24/20
3	LDW20-SS317	20I0192-04	Sediment	06/24/20
4	LDW20-SS205	20I0192-05	Sediment	06/24/20
5	LDW20-SS209	20I0192-06	Sediment	06/24/20
6	LDW20-SS213	20I0192-07	Sediment	06/24/20
7	LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
8	LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
9	LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
10	LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
11	LDW20-SC136	20I0192-12	Sediment	06/24/20
12	LDW20-SC131	20I0192-13	Sediment	06/24/20
13	LDW20-SC132	20I0192-14	Sediment	06/24/20
14	LDW20-SC141	20I0192-15	Sediment	06/24/20
15	LDW20-SS131	20I0192-16	Sediment	06/25/20
16	LDW20-SS132	20I0192-17	Sediment	06/25/20
17	LDW20-SS420	20I0192-18	Sediment	06/26/20

LDC #: 49590B3b
SDG #: 20I0192
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

18	LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
19	LDW20-SC157A	20I0192-23	Sediment	06/26/20
20	LDW20-SS420MS	20I0192-18MS	Sediment	06/26/20
21	LDW20-SS420MSD	20I0192-18MSD	Sediment	06/26/20
22				
23				
24				

Notes:

	BK0071						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590B36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Verification

Reviewer: Q
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of initial calibration verification calculation was performed? ___%D or ___%R
~~N~~ N/A Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each ICAL for each instrument?
~~Y~~ N/A Did the initial calibration verification standards meet the %D / %R validation criteria of ≤20.0% / 80-120%?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit ≤ 20.0)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	9/3/10	SII0059-SCV1	2C	BB	21.5	1-6, 9-12, 14-21, MB (dets+ND)	J/UN/A

LDC #: 49490B3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: q
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?

Y [✓ N] N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D validation criteria of ≤20.0%?

Level IV Only

Y N [✓ N/A] Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/9/20	20160847CCD7	1C	BB	26.4	( )	14-21. (dets+ND)	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		~~+BB ≥~~ +d
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: ~~49590B36~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

Reviewer: a

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Level IV/D Only

Y N ~~N~~/A Were CRQLs adjusted for sample dilutions, dry weight factors, etc.?
Y N N/A Did the reported results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results?
Y ~~N~~ N/A Did the relative percent differences of detected compounds between two columns/detectors ≤40%?
If no, please see findings bellow.

#	Compound Name	Sample ID	%RPD Between Two Columns/Detectors Limit (≤ 40%)	Qualifications
	~~AA~~	4	41.8	~~J+ (A)~~
	~~BB~~		45.5	
	BB	6	43.6	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Metals

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Arsenic by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A
Mercury by EPA SW 846 Method 7471B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Total Days From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Required Holding Time (in Days) From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC153B	Mercury	88	28	J (all detects)	P

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the methods.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

The laboratory has indicated that there were no duplicate (DUP) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to technical holding time, data were qualified as estimated in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC153B	Mercury	J (all detects)	P	Technical holding times

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590B4a

SDG #: 20I0192

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: GF

2nd Reviewer: GF

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A/7471B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A SW	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	N	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	N	not reviewed
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	N	
XIV	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
2	LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
3	LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1, 2	As
3	Hg

Analysis Method

ICP	
ICP-MS	As
CVAA	Hg

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)
All samples were properly preserved (water samples to a pH of <2) and analyzed within the required holding time with the following exceptions.

Method:		Mercury by 7471B, HT = 28 days			
Sample ID	Sampling Date	Analysis Date	Total Time from Collection to Analysis (Days)	Qualifier	Det/ND
3	6/26/2020	9/22/2020	88	J/R/P	Det

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS313	20I0192-03	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS317	20I0192-04	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS205	20I0192-05	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS209	20I0192-06	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS213	20I0192-07	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC136	20I0192-12	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC131	20I0192-13	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC132	20I0192-14	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SC141	20I0192-15	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS131	20I0192-16	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS132	20I0192-17	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS420	20I0192-18	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS380	20I0192-19	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SC157A	20I0192-23	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS311MS	20I0192-02MS	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS311DUP	20I0192-02DUP	Sediment	06/24/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	All samples in SDG 20I0192

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	%R (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS311MS (LDW20-SS311 LDW20-SS311DUP)	Total organic carbon	126 (75-125)	J (all detects)	A

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to MS %R, data were qualified as estimated in two samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS311 LDW20-SS311DUP	Total organic carbon	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike (%R)

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590B6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 4/5/20
SDG #: 20I0192 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/SW	A
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	SW	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
2	LDW20-SS313	20I0192-03	Sediment	06/24/20
3	LDW20-SS317	20I0192-04	Sediment	06/24/20
4	LDW20-SS205	20I0192-05	Sediment	06/24/20
5	LDW20-SS209	20I0192-06	Sediment	06/24/20
6	LDW20-SS213	20I0192-07	Sediment	06/24/20
7	LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
8	LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
9	LDW20-IT112	20I0192-10	Sediment	06/24/20
10	LDW20-IT120	20I0192-11	Sediment	06/24/20
11	LDW20-SC136	20I0192-12	Sediment	06/24/20
12	LDW20-SC131	20I0192-13	Sediment	06/24/20
13	LDW20-SC132	20I0192-14	Sediment	06/24/20
14	LDW20-SC141	20I0192-15	Sediment	06/24/20
15	LDW20-SS131	20I0192-16	Sediment	06/25/20
16	LDW20-SS132	20I0192-17	Sediment	06/25/20
17	LDW20-SS420	20I0192-18	Sediment	06/26/20

LDC #: 49590B6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0192 Stage 2B Page: 2 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: CA
2nd Reviewer: CA

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-SS380	20I0192-19	Sediment	06/26/20
19	LDW20-SC153B	20I0192-22	Sediment	06/26/20
20	LDW20-SC157A	20I0192-23	Sediment	06/26/20
21	LDW20-SS311MS	20I0192-02MS	Sediment	06/24/20
22	LDW20-SS311DUP	20I0192-02DUP	Sediment	06/24/20
23				
24				
25				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 20	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
21	TOC
22	Total solids, TOC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: All

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (units)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

METHOD: Inorganics

MS analysis was performed by the laboratory. All MS percent recoveries (%R) were within the acceptable limits with the following exceptions.

MS ID	Matrix	Analyte	MS %R	%R Limit	Assocaited Samples	Qualification	Det/ND
21	s	TOC	126	75-125	22, 1	Jdet/A	Det

Comments:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0192

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS302	20I0192-01	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
LDW20-SS268	20I0192-20	Sediment	06/26/20
LDW20-SS236	20I0192-21	Sediment	06/26/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/16/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	59.7 ng/mL (45-56) 57.9 ng/mL (45-56) 59.9 ng/mL (45-55) 60.1 ng/mL (43-58)	LDW20-SS302 LDW20-SS311 LDW20-IT307	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P
10/20/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	58.2 ng/mL (45-55)	LDW20-SS236	J (all detects)	P
10/17/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	57.2 ng/mL (45-56) 58.0 ng/mL (45-55)	LDW20-IT303 LDW20-SS268	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0143-BLK1	10/08/20	OCDD	0.486 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0192

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0192	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A
All samples in SDG 20I0192	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A

Sample	Compound	Finding	Criteria	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS302 LDW20-IT303	OCDD	Sample result exceeded calibration range.	Reported result should be within calibration range.	J (all detects)	P

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration, compounds reported as EMPC, and results exceeding calibration range, data were qualified as estimated in six samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS302 LDW20-SS311 LDW20-IT307	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-SS236	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	J (all detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-IT303 LDW20-SS268	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-SS302 LDW20-SS311 LDW20-IT307 LDW20-IT303 LDW20-SS268 LDW20-SS236	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS302 LDW20-SS311 LDW20-IT307 LDW20-IT303 LDW20-SS268 LDW20-SS236	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS302 LDW20-IT303	OCDD	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Compound quantitation (exceeded range)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0192

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590B21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/9/20
SDG #: 20I0192 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: 2
2nd Reviewer: A

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20/35%. & ICV ≤ QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	LCS
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	SW N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System performance	N	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS302	20I0192-01	Sediment	06/24/20
2	LDW20-SS311	20I0192-02	Sediment	06/24/20
3	LDW20-IT307	20I0192-08	Sediment	06/24/20
4	LDW20-IT303	20I0192-09	Sediment	06/24/20
5	LDW20-SS268	20I0192-20	Sediment	06/26/20
6	LDW20-SS236	20I0192-21	Sediment	06/26/20
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

LDC #: 49590B21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?

Y N N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?

Y N N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) Finding %D	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/16/20	20101609A	K	59.7 (45-56)		1-3, MB	J/UJ/P
			N	57.9 ↓		(dets + ND)	
			O	59.9 (45-55)			
			P	60.1 (43-58)			↓
	10/20/20	20102002	O	58.2 (45-55)		~~4-5~~ 6, (dets)	J/UJ/P
	10/17/20	20101623	K	57.2 (45-56)		4-5 (dets)	J/UJ/P
			~~N~~ O	58.0 (45-55			↓
			~~P~~	~~57.1 (43-58~~			

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/8/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/16/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0143-BLK1	5X											
G	0.486	2.43											

LDC #: ~~49590B~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: PG

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N ~~N/A~~ Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N ~~N/A~~ Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		~~All~~	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
			~~All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl ether interference~~		~~Jdets/A~~
		1, 4	G > calib range		Jdets/P

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

LDC Report# 49590C2a

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0211

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590C2a
SDG #: 20I0211
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: CV
2nd Reviewer: M

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples ISRM	A/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
2	LDW20-SS307 (A)	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
3	LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
4	LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	BIJ0216						
	BI1010 9						

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0211

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC126	20I0211-02	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC138	20I0211-03	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC111	20I0211-06	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC108	20I0211-07	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC104	20I0211-08	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC103	20I0211-09	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC100	20I0211-10	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC114	20I0211-11	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC115	20I0211-12	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC118	20I0211-13	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC119	20I0211-14	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC122	20I0211-15	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC129	20I0211-16	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS315	20I0211-20	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
10/10/20	20100954ECD7	2C	Aroclor-1260	20.8	LDW20-SC114 LDW20-SC115 LDW20-SC118 LDW20-SC119 LDW20-SC122 LDW20-SC129 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SS315	Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standards	%R (Limits)	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC138	Hexabromobiphenyl	48 (50-200)	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC149MS/MSD (LDW20-SC149)	Aroclor-1260	269 (58-120)	-	J (all detects)	A

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	RPD (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC149MS/MSD (LDW20-SC149)	Aroclor-1260	69.5 (≤35)	J (all detects)	A

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations met validation criteria.

XI. Target Compound Identification

All target compound identifications met validation criteria.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, internal standard %R, and MS/MSD %R and RPD, data were qualified as estimated in twelve samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC114 LDW20-SC115 LDW20-SC118 LDW20-SC119 LDW20-SC122 LDW20-SC129 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SS315	Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SC138	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Internal standards (%R)
LDW20-SC149	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-SC149	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (RPD)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590C3b

SDG #: 20I0211

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/19/20

Page: 1 of 2

Reviewer: Q

2nd Reviewer: N

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSDs ≤ 20%. %R within 80-120%
III.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV within 80-120%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes /FS	A/SW	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	SW	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A/A	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	A	
XI.	Target compound identification	A	
XII	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
2	LDW20-SC126	20I0211-02	Sediment	06/25/20
3 N	LDW20-SC138	20I0211-03	Sediment	06/25/20
4	LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
5	LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
6	LDW20-SC111	20I0211-06	Sediment	06/25/20
7	LDW20-SC108	20I0211-07	Sediment	06/25/20
8	LDW20-SC104	20I0211-08	Sediment	06/25/20
9	LDW20-SC103	20I0211-09	Sediment	06/25/20
10	LDW20-SC100	20I0211-10	Sediment	06/25/20
11	LDW20-SC114	20I0211-11	Sediment	06/25/20
12	LDW20-SC115	20I0211-12	Sediment	06/25/20
13	LDW20-SC118	20I0211-13	Sediment	06/25/20
14	LDW20-SC119	20I0211-14	Sediment	06/25/20
15	LDW20-SC122	20I0211-15	Sediment	06/25/20
16	LDW20-SC129	20I0211-16	Sediment	06/25/20
17	LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20

LDC #: 49590C3b

SDG #: 20I0211

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/10/20

Reviewer: Q

2nd Reviewer: M

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

18	LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
19	LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
20	LDW20-SS315	20I0211-20	Sediment	06/29/20
21	LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
22	LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20
23				
24				
25				

Notes:

LDC #: 49590C36

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: Q

Method: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
IIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20%?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥0.990?			✓	
Were the RT windows properly established?	✓			
IIb. Initial calibration verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?	✓			
III. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration analyzed daily?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20%?		✓		
Were all the retention times within the acceptance windows?	✓			
IV. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?		✓		
V. Field Blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VI. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent recovery (%R) within the QC limits?	✓			
If the percent recovery (%R) of one or more surrogates was outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?	✓			
If any %R was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?	✓			
VII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?		✓		
VIII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per analytical or extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			✓	
X. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XI. Target compound identification				
Were the retention times of reported detects within the RT windows?	✓			
XIII. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

LDC #: 19590236

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?

Y [✓ N] N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D validation criteria of ≤20.0%?

Level IV Only

[✓ Y] N N/A Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/10/10	20100954ECDT	2C	Aroclor-1260	20.8	( )	11-20 (dets)	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		qual Aroclor-12~~54~~ 48
						( )		↓ -1260
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 49590C3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: GC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y)N N/A Were all internal standard area counts within -50 to +100% of the ICAL midpoint standard?

(Y)N N/A Were the retention times of the internal standards within +/- 0.05 min seconds of the retention times of the ICAL midpoint standard?

#	Date	Sample ID	Internal Standard	~~Area~~ 70R (Limits)	RT (Limits)	Qualifications
		3 (dots)	HBP	48 (50-200)		J/UJ/A (BB)

HBP = Hexabromobiphenyl

LDC #: 49590C3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: q

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG?

[✓ Y] N N/A Was an MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples for each matrix or whenever a sample extraction was performed?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) within QC limits?

#	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	21/22	Aroclor 1260	269 (58-120)	( )	( )	1 (dets)	J dets/A
		↓	( )	( )	69.5 (≤35)		↓
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49590036

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC ✓ HPLC _____

The calibration factors (CF) and relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated using the following calculations:

CF = A/C
Average CF = sum of the CF/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

Where: A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound
S = Standard deviation of calibration factors
X = Mean of calibration factors

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Reported CF (100 std)	Recalculated CF (100 std)	Reported Ave CF (initial)	Recalculated Ave CF (intial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	KAZ	10/9/20	Aroclor-1260-1 (1C)	0.02377	0.02377	0.02389	0.02389	12.03T	12.04
			↓ (2C)	0.03950	0.03950	0.04026	0.04026	3.252	3.25
2									
3									
4									

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49390C36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: ___ GC_HPLC

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Calibration Factors (CF) and the continuing calibration CF were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = 100 * (ave. CF -CF)/ave.CF

Where: ave. CF = initial calibration average CF
CF = continuing calibration CF
A = Area of compound
C = Concentration of compound

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound	Average CF(Ical)/ CCV Conc.	Reported	Recalculated	Reported	Recalculated
					CF/ Conc. CCV	CF/ Conc. CCV	%D	%D
1	20100936CCV	10/10/20	Aroclor 1260 (1c)	250.0	261	261	4.3	4.3
			↓ (2c)	↓	278	278	11.3	11.3
2	20100952CCV	10/10/20	↓	2500	278	278	11.0	11.1
			↓	↓	302	302	20.8	20.8
3								
4								

LDC #: 49596C36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: SF/SS * 100

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: 1

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	
DCB	1C	40.0	37.0	92.5	92.5	
TCMX	↓		37.03.9	79.7	79.7	
DCB	2C		29.8	74.6	74.5	
TCMX	↓	↓	33.0	82.4	82.5	

Sample ID: _____

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

Sample ID: _____

Surrogate	Column/Detector	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery	Percent Recovery	Percent Difference
				Reported	Recalculated	

LDC #: 49590C36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where SSC = Spiked sample concentration SA = Spike added SC = Sample concentration

RPD =(({SSCMS - SSCMSD} * 2) / (SSCMS + SSCMSD))*100 MS = Matrix spike MSD = Matrix spike duplicate

MS/MSD samples: 21/22

Compound	Spike Added (µg/kg)		Sample Conc. (µg/kg)	Spike Sample Concentration (µg/kg)		Matrix spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	---	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
Gasoline (8015)											
Diesel (8015)											
Benzene (8021B)											
Methane (RSK-175)											
2,4-D (8151)											
Dinoseb (8151)											
Naphthalene (8310)											
Anthracene (8310)											
HMX (8330)											
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)											
Aroclor 1260	101	101	76.6	347	168	269	268	90.8	90.5	69.5	69.5

Comments: Refer to Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590C2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

The percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

%Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA

Where SSC = Spiked sample concentration; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentration

RPD =(({SSCLCS - SSCLCSD} * 2) / (SSCLCS + SSCLCSD))*100

LCS = Laboratory Control Sample; LCSD = Laboratory Control Sample duplicate

LCS/LCSD samples: ~~BJ1007O-BS1~~

Compound	Spike Added (ug/kg)		Spike Sample Concentration (ug/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.	Reported	Recalc.
~~Gasoline (8015)~~ ~~RB-120~~	101	101	100	99.6	99.6	99.0	98.8	98.6	0.843	0.40
Diesel (8015)										
Benzene (8021B)										
Methane (RSK-175)										
2,4-D (8151)										
Dinoseb (8151)										
Naphthalene (8310)										
Anthracene (8310)										
HMX (8330)										
2,4,6-Trinitrotoluene (8330)										
~~Aroclor 1260~~	101	101	102	99.7	102	101	98.9	98.7	2.65	2.28

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicate findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590c3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

METHOD: √ GC ___ HPLC

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds within 10% of the reported results?

Concentration= $\frac{(A)(Fv)(Df)}{(RF)(Vs \text{ or } Ws)(\%S/100)}$

A= Area or height of the compound to be measured
Fv= Final Volume of extract
Df= Dilution Factor
RF= Average response factor of the compound In the initial calibration
Vs= Initial volume of the sample
Ws= Initial weight of the sample
%S= Percent Solid

Example:

Sample ID. 1 Compound Name ~~PCB-1260~~

Concentration = $\frac{(184T3)(80)}{(18169T)(0.02389)} = 340.5$

Concentration = $\frac{(340.5 + 363.9 + 386.7 + 404.6 + 419.3) \times 2.5 \times 1}{5 \times 17.78 \times 0.7032} = 76.6$ µg/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentrations (µg/kg)	Recalculated Results Concentrations ( )	Qualifications
	1	~~PCB-1260~~	76.6		

Comments: _____

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Mercury

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0211

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Mercury by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 7471B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 evaluation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Total Days From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Required Holding Time (in Days) From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC149 LDW20-SC149DUP	Mercury	105	28	J (all detects)	P
LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307	Mercury	101	28	J (all detects)	P

II. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the method.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

III. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

IV. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

V. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VI. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VII. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

IX. Sample Result Verification

All sample result verifications were acceptable.

X. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to technical holding time, data were qualified as estimated in five samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Mercury - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC149 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SC149DUP	Mercury	J (all detects)	P	Technical holding times

Duwamish AOC4
Mercury - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Mercury - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590C4c
SDG #: 20I0211
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 4

Date: 11/5/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: Mercury (EPA SW 846 Method 7471B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A SW	
II.	Instrument Calibration	A	
III.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
IV.	Field Blanks	N	
V.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VI.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
VIII.	Field Duplicates	N	
IX.	Sample Result Verification	A	
X.	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
2	LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
3	LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
4	LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
5	LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
6	LDW20-SC149MSD	20I0211-01MSD	Sediment	06/25/20
7	LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				

Notes:

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?		X		
Were all water samples preserved to a pH of <2.			X	
II. ICP-MS Tune				
Were mass resolutions within 0.1 amu for all isotopes in the tuning solution?			X	
Were %RSDs of isoptoes in the tuning solution ≤5%?			X	
III. Calibration				
Were all instuments calibrated daily?	X			
Were the proper standards used?	X			
Were all initial and continuing calibration verifications within the 90-110% (80-120% for mercury) QC limits?	X			
Were the low level standard checks within 70-130%?			X	
Were all initial calibration correlation coefficients within limits as specifed by the method?	X			
IV. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	X			
Was there contamination in the method blanks?		X		
Was there contamination in the initial and continuing calibration blanks?		X		
V. Interference Check Sample				
Were the interference check samples performed daily?			X	
Were the AB solution recoveries within 80-120%?			X	
VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates/Laboratory Duplicates				
Were MS/MSD recoveries with the QC limits? (If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4, no action was taken.)	X			
Were the MS/MSD or laboratory duplicate relative percent differences (RPDs) within the QC limits?	X			
VII. Laboratory Control Samples				
Was a LCS analyzed for each batch in the SDG?	X			
Were the LCS recoveries and RPDs (if applicable) within QC limits?	X			

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
VIII. Internal Standards				
Were all percent recoveries within the 30-120% (60-125% for EPA Method 200.8) QC limits?			X	
If the recoveries were outside the limits, was a reanalysis performed?			X	
IX. Serial Dilution				
Were all percent differences <10%?			X	
Was there evidence of negative interference? If yes, professional judgement will be used to qualify the data.			X	
X. Sample Result Verification				
Were all reporting limits adjusted to reflect sample dilutions?	X			
Were all soil samples dry weight corrected?	X			
XI. Overall Assessment of Data				
Was the overall assessment of the data found to be acceptable?	X			
XII. Field Duplicates				
Were field duplicates identifed in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?			X	
XIII. Field Blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?			X	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEETS

Holding Time

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

All samples were properly preserved (water samples to a pH of <2) and analyzed within the required holding time with the following exceptions.

Method:		**Mercury by 7471B, HT = 28 days**			
Sample ID	**Sampling Date**	**Analysis Date**	**Total Time from Collection to Analysis (Days)**	**Qualifier**	**Det/ND**
1, 7	6/25/2020	10/8/2020	105	J/R/P	Det
2, 3, 4	6/29/2020	10/8/2020	101	J/R/P	Det

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

An intial calibration verification (ICV), continuing calibration verification (CCV), low level calibration check (LLCC), and interference check sample (ICSAB) percent recovery (%R) was recalculated for each type of analysis using the following formula:

%R = (Found/True) x 100

Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis

True = concentration of each analyte in the source

Standard ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found (mg/L)	Found (mg/L)	Recalcuated %R	Reported %R	Acceptable (Y/N)
ICV	CVAA	Hg	0.00413	0.004	103.25	103	Y
CCV	CVAA	Hg	0.00405	0.004	101.25	101	Y

Quality Control Sample Recalculations

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

Percent recoveries (%R) for the laboratory control sample (LCS), matrix spike (MS), and post digestion spike (PDS) were recalculated using the following formula:

%R = (Found/True) x 100

Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis. For the MS calculation, Found = SSR (Spiked Sample Result) - SR (Sample Result)

True = concentration of each analyte in the source

The sample and duplicate relative percent difference (RPD) was recalculated using the following formula:

RPD = (Absolute value(S-D)x 200) / (S+D)

S = Original sample concentration

D = Duplicate sample concentration

The serial dilution percent difference (%D) was recalculated using the following formula.

%D = (Absolute value (I - SDR)) x 100 / (I)

I = Initial sample result

SDR = Serial dilution result (with a 5x dilution applied)

Sample ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found/S/I	True/D/SDR	Recalcuated %R/RPD/%D	Reported %R/RPD/%D	Acceptable (Y/N)
LCS	LCS	Hg	0.469	0.5	93.8	93.9	Y
5	MS		0.3261	0.266	123	123	Y
7	Duplicate		0.0569	0.0611	7.12	7.09	Y

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)
Analytes were recalculated and verified using the following equation:
Concentration = (Result from raw data x Final volume x Dilution factor) / (Percent solids x Initial weight)

Sample ID	Analyte	Raw Data (ug/L)	Dilution	Initial Weight (g)	Final Volume (mL)	Percent solids (%)	Reported Result (mg/Kg)	Recalcuated Result (mg/Kg)	Acceptable (Y/N)
1	Hg	0.2091	1	0.262	50	70.12	0.0569	0.0569	Y
2	Hg	0.4249	1	0.28	50	48.62	0.156	0.156	Y
3	Hg	0.2596	1	0.291	50	49.04	0.091	0.091	Y
4	Hg	0.36	1	0.263	50	53.05	0.129	0.129	Y

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0211

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC126	20I0211-02	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC138	20I0211-03	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC111	20I0211-06	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC108	20I0211-07	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC104	20I0211-08	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC103	20I0211-09	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC100	20I0211-10	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC114	20I0211-11	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC115	20I0211-12	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC118	20I0211-13	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC119	20I0211-14	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC122	20I0211-15	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC129	20I0211-16	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS315	20I0211-20	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SS315

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

All sample result verifications were acceptable.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590C6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0211 Stage 4 Page: 1 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: G
2nd Reviewer: G

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A, A	
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	A	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
2	LDW20-SC126	20I0211-02	Sediment	06/25/20
3	LDW20-SC138	20I0211-03	Sediment	06/25/20
4	LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
5	LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
6	LDW20-SC111	20I0211-06	Sediment	06/25/20
7	LDW20-SC108	20I0211-07	Sediment	06/25/20
8	LDW20-SC104	20I0211-08	Sediment	06/25/20
9	LDW20-SC103	20I0211-09	Sediment	06/25/20
10	LDW20-SC100	20I0211-10	Sediment	06/25/20
11	LDW20-SC114	20I0211-11	Sediment	06/25/20
12	LDW20-SC115	20I0211-12	Sediment	06/25/20
13	LDW20-SC118	20I0211-13	Sediment	06/25/20
14	LDW20-SC119	20I0211-14	Sediment	06/25/20
15	LDW20-SC122	20I0211-15	Sediment	06/25/20
16	LDW20-SC129	20I0211-16	Sediment	06/25/20
17	LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20

LDC #: 49590C6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0211 Stage 4 Page: 2 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
19	LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
20	LDW20-SS315	20I0211-20	Sediment	06/29/20
21	LDW20-SC149MS	20I0211-01MS	Sediment	06/25/20
22	LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20
23				
24				
25				

Notes:

METHOD: Inorganics				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times were met?	X			
II. Calibration				
Were all instuments calibrated at the requried frequency?	X			
Were the proper number of standards used?	X			
Were all initial and continuing calibration verifications within the QC limits?	X			
Were all initial calibration correlation coefficients within limits as specifed by the method?	X			
Were balance checks performed as required?	X			
III. Blanks				
Was a method blank assoicated with every sample in this SDG?	X			
Was there contamination in the method blanks?		X		
Was there contamination in the initial and continuing calibration blanks?	X			
IV. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates/Laboratory Duplicates				
Were MS/MSD recoveries with the QC limits? (If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4, no action was taken.)	X			
Were the MS/MSD or laboratory duplicate relative percent differences (RPDs) within the QC limits?	X			
V. Laboratory Control Samples				
Was a LCS analyzed for each batch in the SDG?	X			
Were the LCS recoveries and RPDs (if applicable) within QC limits?	X			
X. Sample Result Verification				
Were all reproting limits adjusted to reflect sample dilutions?	X			
Were all soil samples dry weight corrected?	X			
XI. Overall Assessment of Data				
Was the overall assessment of the data found to be acceptable?	X			

METHOD: Inorganics				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
XII. Field Duplicates				
Were field duplicates identifed in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?			X	
XIII. Field Blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?			X	

Sample Specific Element Reference

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 20	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
21	TOC
22	Total solids, TOC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 19, 20

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (units)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

LDC #: 49590C6

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial and Continuing Calibration Calculation Verification

Reviewer: a

METHOD: Inorganics, Method See cover

An initial or continuing calibration verification percent recovery (%R) was recalculated for each type of analysis using the following formula:

%R = Found x 100 / True

Where, Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis of the ICV or CCV solution
True = concentration of each analyte in the ICV or CCV source

Type of Analysis	Analyte	Standard ID	Found (units)	True (units)	Recalculated %R	Reported %R	Acceptable (Y/N)
Initial verification	TOC	ICV	44.345	44.446	99.8	99.8	Y
Calibration verification	↓	CCV	44.911	↓	101	101	↓
Calibration verification	↓	CCV	45.408	↓	102	102	↓

Comments: Refer to Calibration Verification findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

METHOD: Inorganics

Percent recoveries (%R) for the laboratory control sample (LCS) and matrix spike (MS) were recalcuated using the following formula.
%R = (Found/True) x 100
Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis. For the MS calculation, Found = SSR (Spiked Sample Result) - SR (Sample Result)
True = concentraiton of each analyte in the source
The sample and duplciate relative percent difference (RPD) was recalcuated using the following formula.
RPD = (Absolute value(S-D)x 200) / (S+D)
S = Original sample concentraiton
D = Duplciate sample concentration

Sample ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found/S	True/D	Recalcuated %R/RPD	Reported %R/RPD	Acceptable (Y/N)
LCS	LCS	TOC	44.9	44.4	101	101	Y
21	MS	TOC	0.96	1.06	90.6	90.5	Y
22	Duplicate	TS	70.12	69.64	0.687	0.685	Y

Sample Calculation Verification

METHOD: Inorganics

Analytes were recalcuated and verified using the following equation.

Concentration = (Result from raw data x Final volume x Dilution factor) / (Percent solids (if applicable) x Initial weight or volume)

Sample ID	Analyte	Raw Data (%)	Tare (g)	Dry (g)	Sample (g)	Percent solids (%)	Reported Result (%)	Recalcuated Result (%)	Acceptable (Y/N)
1	TOC	0.686				70.12	0.98	0.98	Y
2	TOC	1.001				58.69	1.71	1.71	Y
3	TOC	0.988				60.31	1.64	1.64	Y
4	TOC	1.277				60.72	2.10	2.10	Y
5	TOC	2.428				35.18	6.90	6.90	Y
6	TOC	0.904				58.65	1.54	1.54	Y
7	TOC	0.98				57.68	1.70	1.70	Y
8	TOC	1.073				60.24	1.78	1.78	Y
9	TOC	1.03				58.43	1.76	1.76	Y
10	TOC	0.826				60.09	1.37	1.37	Y
11	Total solids		0.8097	4.1573	6.8835		55.12	55.12	Y
12	Total solids		0.8028	4.1331	6.6689		56.77	56.77	Y
13	Total solids		0.8	3.9301	6.5531		54.41	54.41	Y
14	Total solids		0.8015	4.3268	6.7944		58.82	58.82	Y
15	Total solids		0.8028	3.7227	6.153		54.58	54.58	Y
16	Total solids		0.7947	3.8377	6.545		52.92	52.92	Y
17	Total solids		0.8001	3.6139	6.588		48.62	48.62	Y
18	Total solids		0.8097	3.9267	7.1658		49.04	49.04	Y
19	Total solids		0.7856	3.663	6.2096		53.05	53.05	Y
20	Total solids		0.8028	3.9387	7.0375		50.30	50.30	Y

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0211

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The minimum S/N ratio was greater than or equal to 10 for each unlabeled compound and labeled compound.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/20/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	58.2 ng/mL (45-55)	All samples in SDG 20I0211	J (all detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The minimum S/N ratio was greater than or equal to 10 for each unlabeled compound and labeled compound.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0365-BLK1	10/14/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDD	0.280 ng/Kg 1.78 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0211

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates/Duplicate Sample Analysis

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0211	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A
All samples in SDG 20I0211	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A
LDW20-SS300	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A

XII. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications met validation criteria.

XIII. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration, compounds reported as EMPC, and CDPE interference, data were qualified as estimated in seven samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC149 LDW20-SC201B LDW20-IT300 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SC149DUP	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	J (all detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-SC149 LDW20-SC201B LDW20-IT300 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SC149DUP	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SC149 LDW20-SC201B LDW20-IT300 LDW20-SS300 LDW20-SS305 LDW20-SS307 LDW20-SC149DUP	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS300	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (CDPE interference)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0211

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590C21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/10/20
SDG #: 20I0211 Stage 4 Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer: RC

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD≤20/35%. ICV≤QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV≤QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates/DMP	N/A	>RL
VIII.	Laboratory control samples/SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	SW	
XII.	Target compound identification	A	
XIII.	System performance	A	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; ND = No compounds detected; D = Duplicate; SB=Source blank
N = Not provided/applicable; R = Rinsate; TB = Trip blank; OTHER:
SW = See worksheet; FB = Field blank; EB = Equipment blank

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC149	20I0211-01	Sediment	06/25/20
2	LDW20-SC201B	20I0211-04	Sediment	06/25/20
3	LDW20-IT300	20I0211-05	Sediment	06/25/20
4	LDW20-SS300	20I0211-17	Sediment	06/29/20
5	LDW20-SS305	20I0211-18	Sediment	06/29/20
6	LDW20-SS307	20I0211-19	Sediment	06/29/20
7	LDW20-SC149DUP	20I0211-01DUP	Sediment	06/25/20
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

LDC #: 49590c21

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: 9

Method: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
All technical holding times were met.	√			
Cooler temperature criteria were met.	√			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check				
Was PFK exact mass 380.9760 verified?	√			
Were the retention time windows established for all homologues?	√			
Was the chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomers ≤ 25%?	√			
Is the static resolving power at least 10,000 (10% valley definition)?	√			
Was the mass resolution adequately check with PFK?	√			
Was the presence of 1,2,8,9-TCDD and 1,3,4,6,8-PeCDF verified?	√			
III. Initial calibration and Initial calibration verification				
Was the initial calibration performed at 5 concentration levels?	√			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20% for unlabeled compounds and ≤ 35% for unlabeled compounds?	√			
Did all calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?	√			
Was the signal to noise ratio for each target compound and labeled compound ≥ 10?	√			
Was an initial calibration verification (ICV) standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	√			
Were all ICV concentrations for the unlabeled and labeled compounds within QC limits?	√			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12-hour period?	√			
Were all continuing calibration concentrations for the unlabeled and labeled compounds within QC limits?	~~√~~	✓		
Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?	√			
V. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	√			
Was a method blank performed for each matrix and whenever a sample extraction was performed?	√			
Was there contamination in the method blanks?	✓	~~√~~		
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		√		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			√	
VII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?		√		
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?			√	

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
VIII. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	√			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	√			
IX. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?		√		
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			√	
X. Labeled Compounds				
Were labeled compounds within QC limits?	√	~~√~~		
Was the minimum S/N ratio of all labeled compound peaks ≥ 10?	√			
XI. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	√			
Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	√			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	√			
XII. Target compound identification				
For 2,3,7,8 substituted congeners with associated labeled standards, were the retention times of the two quantitation peaks within -1 to 3 sec. of the RT of the labeled standard?	√			
For 2,3,7,8 substituted congeners without associated labeled standards, were the relative retention times of the two quantitation peaks within 0.005 time units of the RRT measured in the routine calibration?	√			
For non-2,3,7,8 substituted congeners, were the retention times of the two quantitation peaks within RT established in the performance check solution?	√			
Did selected ion current profile (SICP) contain all characteristic ions listed in Method 1613B, Table 8?	√			
Was the Ion Abundance Ratio for the two quantitation ions within criteria?		√		
Was the signal to noise ratio for each target compound ≥2.5 and ≥10 for the labeled compound?	√			
Does the maximum intensity of each specified characteristic ion coincide within ± 2 seconds (includes labeled standards)?	√			
For PCDF identification, was any signal (S/N ≥ 2.5, at ± seconds RT) detected in the corresponding PCDPE channel?			√	
Was an acceptable lock mass recorded and monitored?	√			
XIII. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	√			
XIV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	√			

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590C21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?
Y (N) N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?
Y (N) N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) Finding %D	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/20/20	20102002	O	58.2 (45-55)		All (dets)	J/UJ/A

VALIDATION FINDINGS WOR/UHEET
Blanks

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/14/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/20/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0365-BLK1	5X											
F	0.280	1.4											
G	1.78	8.9											

LDC #: 49390C21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N N/A Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
		4	All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl either interference		Jdets/A

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

LDC #: 49590C21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

RRF = $(A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$
average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A_x = Area of compound,
C_x = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CS3 std)	Recalculated RRF (CS3 std)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	KEAL	7/1/20	2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)	0.8223	0.8223	0.8118	0.8117	6.7	6.7
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)	1.2310	1.2310	1.2136	1.2125	11.4	11.4
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)	0.9576	0.9576	1.0254	1.0255	10.8	10.8
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)	1.1246	1.1246	1.1931	1.1930	12.3	12.3
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)	1.3922	1.3922	1.3628	1.3627	8.0	8.0
2			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)						
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)						
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)						
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)						
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)						
3			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)						
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)						
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)						
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)						
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)						

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590C2

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = 100 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported Conc (CC)	Recalculated Conc (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	20102022	10/20/20	2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)	0.8223	0.8766	0.8766	6.6	6.6
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)	1.2310	1.3090	1.3090	6.3	6.3
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)	0.9576	0.9087	0.9087	5.1	5.1
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)	1.1246	1.1710	1.1710	4.1	4.1
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)	1.3922	1.4666	1.4666	5.3	5.3
2			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)					
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)					
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)					
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)					
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)					
3			2,3,7,8-TCDF (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDF)					
			2,3,7,8-TCDD (^{13}C-2,3,7,8-TCDD)					
			1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD (^{13}C-1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD)					
			1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD (^{13}C-1,2,4,6,7,8,-HpCDD)					
			OCDF (^{13}C-OCDF)					

Comments: Refer to Routine Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590C21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Sample Results Verification

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratoy control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate (if applicable) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * SSC/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = | LCS - LCSD | * 2/(LCS + LCSD) LCS = Laboraotry control sample percent recovery LCSD = Laboratory control sample duplicate percent recovery

LCS ID: BIJ0365-BS1

Compound	Spike Added (ng/kg)		Spiked Sample Concentration (ng/kg)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
2,3,7,8-TCDD	20.0	NA	22.0	NA	110	110				
1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	100	↓	104	↓	104	104				
1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	↓	↓	104	↓	104	104				
1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	↓	↓	118	↓	118	118				
OCDF	200	↓	229	↓	114	114				

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590C4

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(DF)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(\%S)}$

A_x = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured

A_{is} = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard

I_s = Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)

V_o = Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).

RRF = Relative Response Factor (average) from the initial calibration

Df = Dilution Factor.

%S = Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.

Example:

Sample I.D. 1, F:

Conc. = $\frac{(2.76e4+2.19e4)(100.0)(20)}{((5.29e4+5.50e4)(1.126)(14.53)(0.6916)}$

= 83.9 ng/kg

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ng/kg)	Calculated Concentration ( )	Acceptable (Y/N)
	1	F	83.9		

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0798-BLK1	09/30/20	Butylbenzylphthalate	13.8 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0216

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT263MS/MSD (LDW20-IT263)	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	-	138 (34-130)	J (all detects)	A

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standards	Area (Limits)	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT263	Perylene-d12 Di-n-octylphthalate-d4	184177 (195564.5-782258) 280059 (283187.5-1132750)	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene Benzofluoranthenes, total	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to MS/MSD %R, and internal standard area, data were qualified as estimated in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT263	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)
LDW20-IT263	Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene Benzo(g,h,i)perylene Benzofluoranthenes, total	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Internal standards (area)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D2a

SDG #: 20I0216

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: Q

2nd Reviewer: A

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	SW	
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	SRM
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	SW	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
2	LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
3	LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

	BII0798						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1.Dibenz(a,h)+(a,c)anthracene
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1.Benzo(j)fluoranthene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1.Benzo(b)naphtho(2,1-d)thiophene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1.
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1.
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1.
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1.
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1.
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1.
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1.
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1.
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1.
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1.
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1.
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1.
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1.
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1.
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1.
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1.
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1.
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1.
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW. Chrysene/Triphenylene	W1.
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX.Benzo(j)+(k)fluoranthene	X1.
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. Naphthobenzophiophene	Y1.
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ.Benzofluoranthenes, Total	Z1.

LDC #: 49590b2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each concentration preparation level?
Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample?
Y N N/A Was the blank contaminated? If yes, please see qualification below.

Blank extraction date: 9/30/10 **Blank analysis date:** 10/13/10
Conc. units: ug/Kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	BI0798-BLK1									
AAA	13.8									

Blank extraction date: _____ **Blank analysis date:** _____
Conc. units: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as the phthalates and TICs noted above that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 49590D2a

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.

[✓ Y] N N/A Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	2/3	ZZZ	( )	138 (34-130)	( )	1 (dets)	J dets/A
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49590D2A

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 4
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Were all internal standard area counts within -50 to +100 of the associated calibration standard?

Y N N/A Were the retention times of the internal standards within +/- 30 seconds of the retention times of the associated calibration standard?

#	Date	Sample ID	Internal Standard	Area (Limits)	RT (Limits)	Qualifications
		1 (dets)	PRY	184177 (195564.5 - 782258)		√ UJ / ☆ ~~ZZZ~~ *
			FFF-d4	280059 (283187.5 - 1132750)		
		2 (MS)	PRY	174867 (	)	No Qual
			FFF-d4	272097 (	)	
		3 (MSD)	PRY	165980 (	)	
			FFF-d4	271438 (	)	
						* qual ZZZ, III
						UJ. ~~KK~~. LL
						ZZZ

(DCB) = 1,4-Dichlorobenzene-d4
(NPT) = Naphthalene-d8
(ANT) = Acenaphthene-d10
(PHN) = Phenanthrene-d10
(CRY) = Chrysene-d12
(PRY) = Perylene-d12

FFF-d4 = Di-n-octylphthalate-d4

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT258	20I0216-13	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT373MS	20I0216-01MS	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT373MSD	20I0216-01MSD	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/06/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	30.4 30.2	LDW20-IT373 LDW20-IT258 LDW20-IT382	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A
10/13/20	Benzoic acid Pentachlorophenol	30.4 23.7	LDW20-IT263	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0800-BLK1	09/30/20	Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	1.10 ug/Kg 1.11 ug/Kg 2.07 ug/Kg 2.02 ug/Kg 2.09 ug/Kg 4.91 ug/Kg 4.56 ug/Kg	LDW20-IT373 LDW20-IT258 LDW20-IT382

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-IT382	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	4.39 ug/Kg	4.39U ug/Kg

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Compound	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT263MS/MSD (LDW20-IT263)	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	-	122 (27-120)	NA	-

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

LCS ID	Compound	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
BII0798-BS2	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	123 (27-120)	LDW20-IT263	NA	-

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT373 LDW20-IT258 LDW20-IT382	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-IT263	Benzoic acid Pentachlorophenol	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-IT382	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	4.39U ug/Kg	A

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D2b

SDG #: 20I0216

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A / A	RSD ≤ 20% .r² ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	SW	
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS.
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
2	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
3	LDW20-IT258	20I0216-13	Sediment	06/12/20
4	LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
5	LDW20-IT373MS	20I0216-01MS	Sediment	06/10/20
6	LDW20-IT373MSD	20I0216-01MSD	Sediment	06/10/20
7	LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
8	LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20
9				

Notes:

BI10800

BI20798

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1.Dibenz(a,h)+(a,c)anthracene
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1.Benzo(j)fluoranthene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1.Benzo(b)naphtho(2,1-d)thiophene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1.
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1.
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1.
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1.
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1.
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1.
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1.
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1.
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1.
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1.
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1.
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1.
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1.
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1.
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1.
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1.
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1.
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1.
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW. Chrysene/Triphenylene	W1.
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX.Benzo(j)+(k)fluoranthene	X1.
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. Naphthobenzophiophene	Y1.
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ.Benzofluoranthenes, Total	Z1.

LDC #: 49590B2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/6/20	NT8201006T	HH	30.4		1, 3-4, 7-8, MB	J/UN/A
			KK	30.2		(dets)	
	10/13/20	NT10201013S5	PP	30.4		2, 4-5, MB	J/UN/A
			TT	23.7		(dets)	

LDC #: 49590

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each concentration preparation level?
Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample?
Y N N/A Was the blank contaminated? If yes, please see qualification below.

Blank extraction date: 9/30/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/6/20
Conc. units: ug/Kg Associated Samples: ~~AH~~ 1, 3-4

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
BII	0800-BK1	4								
CCC	1.10									
DDD	1.11									
~~EEE~~	2.07									
HHH	2.02									
III	2.09									
JJJ	4.91									
KKK	4.56		4.39/U							

Blank extraction date: _____ **Blank analysis date:** _____
Conc. units: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as the phthalates and TICs noted above that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

LDC #: 49590D-6

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were a matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG? If no, indicate which matrix does not have an associated MS/MSD. Soil / Water.
[✓ Y] N N/A Was a MS/MSD analyzed every 20 samples of each matrix?
Y [✓ N] N/A Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	MS/MSD ID	Compound	MS %R (Limits)	MSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	7/8	QQ	( )	122 (27-120)	( )	2 (ND)	~~Jdets/A~~
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49590D2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: a
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Was a LCS required?

Y [✓ N] N/A Were the LCS/LCSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

#	Date	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		BII0798-BS	QQ	123 (27-120)	( )	( )	2. MB (ND)	J dets/P
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		
				( )	( )	( )		

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Hexachlorobenzene

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Hexachlorobenzene by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8081B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at 12 hour intervals.

The individual 4,4'-DDT and Endrin breakdowns (%BD) were less than or equal to 15.0%.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0%.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Hexachlorobenzene - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D3a
SDG #: 20I0216
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: CF
2nd Reviewer: AV

METHOD: GC Hexachlorobenzene (EPA SW846 Method 8081B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC Instrument Performance Check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes /IS	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System Performance	N	
XIV	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
2	LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
3	LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC238A	20I0216-02	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC235A	20I0216-03	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC250A	20I0216-04	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT252	20I0216-05	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC269A	20I0216-07	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC261A	20I0216-08	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC255A	20I0216-09	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC245A	20I0216-10	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC230A	20I0216-14	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC222A	20I0216-15	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC219A	20I0216-16	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC219B	20I0216-17	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-IT425	20I0216-18	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT367	20I0216-19	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT382MS	20I0216-20MS	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT382SMD	20I0216-20MSD	Sediment	06/17/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082A

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

The sample results for detected compounds from the two columns were within 40% relative percent difference (RPD) with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT425	Aroclor-1254	41.3	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to RPD between two columns, data were qualified as estimated in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT425	Aroclor-1254	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D3b
SDG #: 20I0216
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q
2nd Reviewer: M

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082) A

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A / A	
III.	Continuing calibration	A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes / IS	A/A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	SN	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
2	LDW20-SC238A	20I0216-02	Sediment	06/10/20
3	LDW20-SC235A	20I0216-03	Sediment	06/10/20
4	LDW20-SC250A	20I0216-04	Sediment	06/10/20
5	LDW20-IT252	20I0216-05	Sediment	06/11/20
6	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
7	LDW20-SC269A	20I0216-07	Sediment	06/11/20
8	LDW20-SC261A	20I0216-08	Sediment	06/11/20
9 S	LDW20-SC255A	20I0216-09	Sediment	06/11/20
10	LDW20-SC245A	20I0216-10	Sediment	06/11/20
11	LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
12	LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
13	LDW20-SC230A	20I0216-14	Sediment	06/12/20
14 S	LDW20-SC222A	20I0216-15	Sediment	06/12/20
15	LDW20-SC219A	20I0216-16	Sediment	06/12/20
16 S	LDW20-SC219B	20I0216-17	Sediment	06/12/20
17	LDW20-IT425	20I0216-18	Sediment	06/17/20

LDC #: 49590D3b
SDG #: 20I0216
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

18	LDW20-IT367	20I0216-19	Sediment	06/17/20
19	LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
20	LDW20-IT382MS	20I0216-20MS	Sediment	06/17/20
21	LDW20-IT382SMD	20I0216-20MSD	Sediment	06/17/20
22				
23				
24				

Notes:

	BI 10123						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590B36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

Reviewer: Q

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Level IV/D Only

Y N N/A Were CRQLs adjusted for sample dilutions, dry weight factors, etc.?
Y N N/A Did the reported results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results?
Y N N/A Did the relative percent differences of detected compounds between two columns/detectors ≤40%?
If no, please see findings bellow.

#	Compound Name	Sample ID	%RPD Between Two Columns/Detectors Limit (≤ 40%)	Qualifications
	AA	17	41.3	J dets/A

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Metals

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT373MS	20I0216-01MS	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT373MSD	20I0216-01MSD	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT373DUP	20I0216-01DUP	Sediment	06/10/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Arsenic, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Silver, and Zinc by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A
Mercury by EPA SW 846 Method 7471B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Total Days From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Required Holding Time (in Days) From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT263 LDW20-SC271	Mercury	119	28	J (all detects)	P
LDW20-SS271	Mercury	118	28	J (all detects)	P

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the methods.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Spike ID (Associated Samples)	Analyte	MS (%R) (Limits)	MSD (%R) (Limits)	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT373MS/MSD (LDW20-IT373DUP)	Silver	74.2 (75-125)	67.5 (75-125)	J (all detects)	A

Percent recoveries (%R) were not within QC limits for silver, no data were qualified for sample LDW20-IT373 since this analyte was not reported.

Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to technical holding time and MS/MSD %R, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT263 LDW20-SC271 LDW20-SS271	Mercury	J (all detects)	P	Technical holding times
LDW20-IT373DUP	Silver	J (all detects)	A	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicate (%R)

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D4a
SDG #: 20I0216
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: a
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A/7471B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A, ASW	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	SW	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	N	not reviewed
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	N	
XIV	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
2	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
3	LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
4	LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
5	LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
6	LDW20-IT373MS	20I0216-01MS	Sediment	06/10/20
7	LDW20-IT373MSD	20I0216-01MSD	Sediment	06/10/20
8	LDW20-IT373DUP	20I0216-01DUP	Sediment	06/10/20
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
2	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn, Hg
1, 5	As
3	As, Hg
4	Hg
QC: 6-8	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn

Analysis Method

ICP	
ICP-MS	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn
CVAA	Hg

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)
All samples were properly preserved (water samples to a pH of <2) and analyzed within the required holding time with the following exceptions.

Method:		Mercury by 7471B, HT = 28 days			
Sample ID	Sampling Date	Analysis Date	Total Time from Collection to Analysis (Days)	Qualifier	Det/ND
2, 4	6/11/2020	10/8/2020	119	J/R/P	Det
3	6/12/2020	10/8/2020	118	J/R/P	Det

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

MS/MSD analysis was performed by the laboratory. All MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPDs) were within the acceptable limits with the following exceptions:

MS/MSD ID	Matrix	Analyte	MS %R	MSD %R	%R Limit	RPD	RPD Limit	Associated Samples	Qualification	Det/ND
6, 7	s	Ag	74.2	67.5	75-125			1	No qual, Ag not reported	
								8	J/UJ/A	Det

Comments:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0216

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC238A	20I0216-02	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC235A	20I0216-03	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-SC250A	20I0216-04	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT252	20I0216-05	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC269A	20I0216-07	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC261A	20I0216-08	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC255A	20I0216-09	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC245A	20I0216-10	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-SC230A	20I0216-14	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC222A	20I0216-15	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC219A	20I0216-16	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-SC219B	20I0216-17	Sediment	06/12/20
LDW20-IT425	20I0216-18	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT367	20I0216-19	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
LDW20-IT373DUP1	20I0216-01DUP1	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT373DUP2	20I0216-01DUP2	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263DUP1	20I0216-06DUP1	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT263DUP1	20I0216-06DUP2	Sediment	06/11/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	All samples in SDG 20I0216

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0216

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590D6

SDG #: 20I0216

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

Page: 1 of 2

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A, A	
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT373	20I0216-01	Sediment	06/10/20
2	LDW20-SC238A	20I0216-02	Sediment	06/10/20
3	LDW20-SC235A	20I0216-03	Sediment	06/10/20
4	LDW20-SC250A	20I0216-04	Sediment	06/10/20
5	LDW20-IT252	20I0216-05	Sediment	06/11/20
6	LDW20-IT263	20I0216-06	Sediment	06/11/20
7	LDW20-SC269A	20I0216-07	Sediment	06/11/20
8	LDW20-SC261A	20I0216-08	Sediment	06/11/20
9	LDW20-SC255A	20I0216-09	Sediment	06/11/20
10	LDW20-SC245A	20I0216-10	Sediment	06/11/20
11	LDW20-SS271	20I0216-11	Sediment	06/12/20
12	LDW20-SC271	20I0216-12	Sediment	06/11/20
13	LDW20-SC230A	20I0216-14	Sediment	06/12/20
14	LDW20-SC222A	20I0216-15	Sediment	06/12/20
15	LDW20-SC219A	20I0216-16	Sediment	06/12/20
16	LDW20-SC219B	20I0216-17	Sediment	06/12/20
17	LDW20-IT425	20I0216-18	Sediment	06/17/20

LDC #: 49590D6
SDG #: 20I0216
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-IT367	20I0216-19	Sediment	06/17/20
19	LDW20-IT382	20I0216-20	Sediment	06/17/20
20	LDW20-IT373DUP 1	20I0216-01DUP 1	Sediment	06/10/20
21	LDW20-IT373~~TRP~~ DUP2	20I0216-01~~TRP~~ DUP2	Sediment	06/10/20
22	LDW20-IT263MS	20I0216-06MS	Sediment	06/11/20
23	LDW20-IT263MSD	20I0216-06MSD	Sediment	06/11/20
24	LDW20-IT263DUP 1	20I0216-06DUP 1	Sediment	06/11/20
25	LDW20-IT263~~TRP~~ DUP2	20I0216-06~~TRP~~ DUP2	Sediment	06/11/20
26				
27				
28				

Notes:

Sample Specific Element Reference

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 19	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
20	Total solids
21	Total solids
22, 23	TOC
24	TOC
25	TOC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: All

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (units)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0226

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT236	20I0226-02	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT232	20I0226-03	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT215	20I0226-05	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-IT240	20I0226-06	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-IT247	20I0226-07	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-IT310	20I0226-08	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-IT356	20I0226-14	Sediment	06/09/20
LDW20-IT369	20I0226-15	Sediment	06/09/20
LDW20-IT372	20I0226-16	Sediment	06/09/20
LDW20-IT377	20I0226-17	Sediment	06/09/20
LDW20-IT364	20I0226-18	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT228	20I0226-19	Sediment	06/10/20
LDW20-IT268	20I0226-20	Sediment	06/11/20
LDW20-IT200MS	20I0226-01MS	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT200MSD	20I0226-01MSD	Sediment	06/04/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/09/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	26.4 24.0	LDW20-IT200 LDW20-IT236 LDW20-IT232 LDW20-IT240 LDW20-IT247 LDW20-IT310 LDW20-IT356 LDW20-IT369 LDW20-IT372 LDW20-IT377 LDW20-IT364 LDW20-IT228	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/12/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	25.6 21.6	LDW20-IT215 LDW20-IT268	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0692-BLK	09/25/20	Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	2.11 ug/Kg 2.28 ug/Kg 3.76 ug/Kg 3.15 ug/Kg 4.00 ug/Kg 8.48 ug/Kg 8.12 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0226

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-IT200	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	38.3 ug/Kg 17.0 ug/Kg	38.3U ug/Kg 17.0U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT236	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	29.9 ug/Kg 9.76 ug/Kg	29.9U ug/Kg 9.76U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT232	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	22.7 ug/Kg	22.7U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT215	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.8 ug/Kg 8.04 ug/Kg	21.8U ug/Kg 8.04U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT240	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	32.2 ug/Kg 5.81 ug/Kg	32.2U ug/Kg 5.81U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT247	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	34.1 ug/Kg 7.42 ug/Kg	34.1U ug/Kg 7.42U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT310	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	37.7 ug/Kg	37.7U ug/Kg

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-IT356	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	41.6 ug/Kg 14.6 ug/Kg	41.6U ug/Kg 14.6U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT369	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.6 ug/Kg	21.6U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT372	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	14.4 ug/Kg	14.4U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT377	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	23.9 ug/Kg	23.9U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT228	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.0 ug/Kg	21.0U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT268	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	23.4 ug/Kg 5.85 ug/Kg	23.4U ug/Kg 5.85U ug/Kg

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations met validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Finding	Criteria	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT364	Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene	Sample result exceeded calibration range.	Reported result should be within calibration range.	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D and results exceeding calibration range, data were qualified as estimated in fourteen samples.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in thirteen samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT200 LDW20-IT236 LDW20-IT232 LDW20-IT240 LDW20-IT247 LDW20-IT310 LDW20-IT356 LDW20-IT369 LDW20-IT372 LDW20-IT377 LDW20-IT364 LDW20-IT228 LDW20-IT215 LDW20-IT268	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-IT364	Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Compound quantitation (exceeded range)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-IT200	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	38.3U ug/Kg 17.0U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT236	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	29.9U ug/Kg 9.76U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT232	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	22.7U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT215	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.8U ug/Kg 8.04U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT240	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	32.2U ug/Kg 5.81U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT247	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	34.1U ug/Kg 7.42U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT310	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	37.7U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT356	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	41.6U ug/Kg 14.6U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT369	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.6U ug/Kg	A

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-IT372	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	14.4U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT377	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	23.9U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT228	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	21.0U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT268	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	23.4U ug/Kg 5.85U ug/Kg	A

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590E2b
SDG #: 20I0226
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer: A

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20% r² ICV ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	M/	CCV ≤ 30%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	M/	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
2	LDW20-IT236	20I0226-02	Sediment	06/04/20
3	LDW20-IT232	20I0226-03	Sediment	06/04/20
4	LDW20-IT215	20I0226-05	Sediment	06/05/20
5	LDW20-IT240	20I0226-06	Sediment	06/05/20
6	LDW20-IT247	20I0226-07	Sediment	06/05/20
7	LDW20-IT310	20I0226-08	Sediment	06/05/20
8	LDW20-IT356	20I0226-14	Sediment	06/09/20
9	LDW20-IT369	20I0226-15	Sediment	06/09/20
10	LDW20-IT372	20I0226-16	Sediment	06/09/20
11	LDW20-IT377	20I0226-17	Sediment	06/09/20
12	LDW20-IT364	20I0226-18	Sediment	06/10/20
13	LDW20-IT228	20I0226-19	Sediment	06/10/20
14	LDW20-IT268	20I0226-20	Sediment	06/11/20

LDC #: 49590E2b

SDG #: 20I0226

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 2 of 2

Reviewer: [signature]

2nd Reviewer: [signature]

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

15	LDW20-IT200MS	20I0226-01MS	Sediment	06/04/20
16	LDW20-IT200MSD	20I0226-01MSD	Sediment	06/04/20
17				
18				
19				

Notes:

	BII069						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1.Dibenz(a,h)+(a,c)anthracene
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1.Benzo(j)fluoranthene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1.Benzo(b)naphtho(2,1-d)thiophene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1.
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1.
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1.
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1.
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1.
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1.
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1.
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1.
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1.
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1.
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1.
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1.
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1.
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1.
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1.
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1.
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1.
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1.
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW. Chrysene/Triphenylene	W1.
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX.Benzo(j)+(k)fluoranthene	X1.
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. Naphthobenzophiophene	Y1.
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ.Benzofluoranthenes, Total	Z1.

LDC #: 49590Z2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

N N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y N N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/9/20	NT820100921	VHH	26.4		1-3, 5-13, 15-16	J/UH/A
			KKK	24.0		MB (dets)	
	10/12/20	NT820101202	VHH	25.6		A 14, 4 (dets)	J/UH/A
			KKK	21.6			

LDC #: 49590E2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

Blank extraction date: 9/25/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/9/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	BII0692-BLK1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
CCC	2.11									
DDD	2.28									
GGG	3.76									
HHH	3.15									
III	4.00									
JJJ >RL	8.48	38.3/U	29.9/U		21.8/U	32.2/U	34.1/U		41.6/U	
KKK ↓	8.12	17.0/U	9.76/U	22.7/U	8.04/U	5.81/U	7.42/U	37.7/U	14.6/U	21.6/U

LDC #: 49590E2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

Blank extraction date: 9/25/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/9/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	BII0692-BLK1	10	11	13	14					
CCC	2.11									
DDD	2.28									
GGG	3.76									
HHH	3.15									
III	4.00									
JJJ >RL	8.48				23.4/U					
KKK I	8.12	14.4/U	23.9/U	21.0/U	5.85/U					

LDC #: 49590226

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

Reviewer: 4
2nd Reviewer: ~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?

Y N N/A Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?

#	Date	Compound	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		12	DDD, ~~EEE~~ > calib range		J det's A

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0226

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-SC155A	20I0226-10	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC166A	20I0226-11	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC166B	20I0226-12	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC208A	20I0226-13	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC208ADL	20I0226-13DL	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC155AMS	20I0226-10MS	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC155AMSD	20I0226-10MSD	Sediment	06/08/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

Sample	Internal Standards	%R (Limits)	Affected Compound	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC208A	Hexabromobiphenyl	46 (50-200)	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

In the case where more than one result was reported for an individual sample, the least technically acceptable results were deemed not reportable as follows:

Sample	Compound	Reason	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC208A	Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Matrix interference.	Not reportable	-
LDW20-SC208ADL	All compounds except Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Results from undiluted analyses were more usable.	Not reportable	-

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC208A	Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data
LDW20-SC208ADL	All compounds except Aroclor-1248 Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	Not reportable	-	Overall assessment of data

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590E3b
SDG #: 20I0226
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 10/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: [illegible]
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
III.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes / IS	A/SW	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII	Overall assessment of data	SW	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
2	LDW20-SC155A	20I0226-10	Sediment	06/08/20
3	LDW20-SC166A	20I0226-11	Sediment	06/08/20
4	LDW20-SC166B	20I0226-12	Sediment	06/08/20
5/4	LDW20-SC208A	20I0226-13	Sediment	06/08/20
6	LDW20-SC208ADL	20I0226-13DL	Sediment	06/08/20
7	LDW20-SC155AMS	20I0226-10MS	Sediment	06/08/20
8	LDW20-SC155AMSD	20I0226-10MSD	Sediment	06/08/20
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

	BI0693						
	BTL: /						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590 E36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Internal Standards

Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: LC/MS Perchlorate

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Were all internal standard area counts within -50 to +100 of the associated calibration standard?

(Y) N N/A Were the retention times of the internal standards within +/- 30 seconds of the retention times of the associated calibration standard?

#	Date	Sample ID	Internal Standard	Area (Limits) 70R	RT (Limits)	Qualifications
		5 (Soils)	HBP	~~140978~~ 46 (50-200)		Y/N/A (BE)

HBP = Hexabromobiphenyl

LDC #: 49590236

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Overall Assessment of Data

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: R

METHOD: ✓ GC ___ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

All available information pertaining to the data were reviewed using professional judgement to compliment the determination of the overall quality of the data.

(Y) N N/A Was the overall quality and usability of the data acceptable?

#	Compound Name	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	5	Z, AA, BB (matrix interference)		NR/A
	6	All except Z, AA, BB		A

Comments: _____

OVRNew.wpd

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Arsenic

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0226

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Arsenic by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the method.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

The laboratory has indicated that there were no duplicate (DUP) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590E4a

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

SDG #: 20I0226

Page: 1 of 1

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: Arsenic (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	N	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	N	not reviewed
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	N	
XIV	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 23, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0226

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-SC164	20I0226-04	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-SS164	20I0226-09	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-SC155A	20I0226-10	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC166A	20I0226-11	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC166B	20I0226-12	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-SC208A	20I0226-13	Sediment	06/08/20
LDW20-IT200MS	20I0226-01MS	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT200MSD	20I0226-01MSD	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT200DUP1	20I0226-01DUP1	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT200DUP2	20I0226-01DUP2	Sediment	06/04/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	LDW20-IT200 LDW20-SC164

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590E6
SDG #: 20I0226
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20
Page: ~ of 1
Reviewer: GT
2nd Reviewer: GT

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A, A	
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT200	20I0226-01	Sediment	06/04/20
~~2~~	~~LDW20-IT236~~	~~20I0226-02~~	~~Sediment~~	~~06/04/20~~
3	LDW20-SC164	20I0226-04	Sediment	06/04/20
4	LDW20-SS164	20I0226-09	Sediment	06/05/20
5	LDW20-SC155A	20I0226-10	Sediment	06/08/20
6	LDW20-SC166A	20I0226-11	Sediment	06/08/20
7	LDW20-SC166B	20I0226-12	Sediment	06/08/20
8	LDW20-SC208A	20I0226-13	Sediment	06/08/20
9	LDW20-IT200MS	20I0226-01MS	Sediment	06/04/20
10	LDW20-IT200MSD	20I0226-01MSD	Sediment	06/04/20
11	LDW20-IT200DUP 1	20I0226-01DUP 1	Sediment	06/04/20
12	LDW20-IT200~~TRP~~ DUP2	20I0226-01~~TRP~~ DUP2	Sediment	06/04/20
13				
14				
15				

Notes:

Sample Specific Element Reference

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 8	Total solids
1, 3-8	TOC
QC:	
9, 10	TOC
11	Total solids, TOC
12	Total solids, TOC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 1, 3

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (units)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

LDC Report# 49590E21

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0226

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT236	20I0226-02	Sediment	06/04/20
LDW20-IT310	20I0226-08	Sediment	06/05/20
LDW20-IT268	20I0226-20	Sediment	06/11/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/20/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	57.3 ng/mL (45-56)	All samples in SDG 20I0226	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0365-BLK1	10/14/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDD	0.280 ng/Kg 1.78 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0226

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0226	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0226	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration and compounds reported as EMPC, data were qualified as estimated in three samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT236 LDW20-IT310 LDW20-IT268	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-IT236 LDW20-IT310 LDW20-IT268	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-IT236 LDW20-IT310 LDW20-IT268	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0226

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590E21
SDG #: 20I0226
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 1
2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A A	RSD ≤ 20/35%. ICV ≤ QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A / A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	SW N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System performance	N	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT236	20I0226-02	Sediment	06/04/20
2	LDW20-IT310	20I0226-08	Sediment	06/05/20
3	LDW20-IT268	20I0226-20	Sediment	06/11/20
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

	BEJ0365						

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590231

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y (N) N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?
Y (N) N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?
(Y) N N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) ~~Finding %D~~	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/20/20	20102002	O	58.2 (45-55)		All	J/UJ/P
	10/20/20	20102016	K	57.3 (45-~~55~~ 56)		All (dets)	J/UJ/P

VALIDATION FINDINGS WOR/UHEET
Blanks

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/14/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/20/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0365-BLK1	5X											
F	0.280	1.4											
G	1.78	8.9											

LDC #: 49590E2-1

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N (N/A) Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N (N/A) Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
			~~All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl ether interference~~		~~Jdets/A~~

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0233

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT319	20I0233-07	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229MS	20I0233-16MS	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229MSD	20I0233-16MSD	Sediment	06/19/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the quality control (QC) summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0750-BLK1	09/28/20	Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	3.00 ug/Kg 3.09 ug/Kg 4.70 ug/Kg 4.34 ug/Kg 4.90 ug/Kg 10.3 ug/Kg 8.89 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0233

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-IT319	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	41.1 ug/Kg 10.5 ug/Kg	41.1U ug/Kg 10.5U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT267	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	18.3 ug/Kg 3.00 ug/Kg	18.3U ug/Kg 3.00U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT260	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	19.6 ug/Kg	19.6U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT360	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	12.7 ug/Kg	12.7U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT259	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	18.8 ug/Kg 4.55 ug/Kg	18.8U ug/Kg 4.55U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT256	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	20.8 ug/Kg	20.8U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT233	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	39.9 ug/Kg 10.3 ug/Kg	39.9U ug/Kg 10.3U ug/Kg
LDW20-IT229	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	28.7 ug/Kg 7.72 ug/Kg	28.7U ug/Kg 7.72U ug/Kg

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

All target compound identifications were within validation criteria.

XIV. System Performance

The system performance was acceptable.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in eight samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-IT319	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	41.1U ug/Kg 10.5U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT267	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	18.3U ug/Kg 3.00U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT260	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	19.6U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT360	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	12.7U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT259	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	18.8U ug/Kg 4.55U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT256	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	20.8U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT233	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	39.9U ug/Kg 10.3U ug/Kg	A
LDW20-IT229	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	28.7U ug/Kg 7.72U ug/Kg	A

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590F2b

SDG #: 20I0233

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 4

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. r^2 ICV ≤ 20%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
IX.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS/D
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	A	
XIII.	Target compound identification	A	
XIV.	System performance	A	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT319	20I0233-07	Sediment	06/19/20
2	LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
3	LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
4	LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
5	LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
6	LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
7	LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
8	LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
9	LDW20-IT229MS	20I0233-16MS	Sediment	06/19/20
10	LDW20-IT229MSD	20I0233-16MSD	Sediment	06/19/20
11				
12				
13				
14				

LDC #: 19390F2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Method: PAH (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	✓			
Was cooler temperature criteria met?	✓			
II. GC/MS Instrument performance check (Not required)				
Were the DFTPP performance results reviewed and found to be within the specified criteria?	✓			
Were all samples analyzed within the 12 hour clock criteria?	✓			
IIIa. Initial calibration				
Did the laboratory perform a 5 point calibration prior to sample analysis?	✓			
Were all percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) > 0.05?	✓			
Was a curve fit used for evaluation? If yes, did the initial calibration meet the curve fit acceptance criteria of ≥ 0.990?	✓			
IIIb. Initial Calibration Verification				
Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each initial calibration for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤30%?	✓			
IV. Continuing calibration				
Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?	✓			
Were all percent differences (%D) ≤ 20% and relative response factors (RRF) ≥ 0.05?	✓			
V. Laboratory Blanks				
Was a laboratory blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	✓			
Was a laboratory blank analyzed for each matrix and concentration?	✓			
Was there contamination in the laboratory blanks?	✓			
VI. Field blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		✓		
Were target compounds detected in the field blanks?			✓	
VII. Surrogate spikes				
Were all surrogate percent differences (%R) within QC limits?	✓			
If 2 or more base neutral or acid surrogates were outside QC limits, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
If any percent recoveries (%R) was less than 10 percent, was a reanalysis performed to confirm %R?			✓	
VIII. Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates				
Were matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyzed in this SDG?	✓			
Were the MS/MSD percent recoveries (%R) and the relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			

LDC #: 49390F2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Reviewer: 9

Validation Area	Yes	No	NA	Findings/Comments
IX. Laboratory control samples				
Was an LCS analyzed per extraction batch?	✓			
Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent difference (RPD) within the QC limits?	✓			
X. Field duplicates				
Were field duplicate pairs identified in this SDG?			✓	
Were target compounds detected in the field duplicates?			✓	
XI. Internal standards				
Were internal standard area counts within -50% or +100% of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
Were retention times within ± 30 seconds of the associated calibration standard?	✓			
XII. Compound quantitation				
Did the laboratory LOQs/RLs meet the QAPP LOQs/RLs?	✓			
Were the correct internal standard (IS), quantitation ion and relative response factor (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?	✓			
Were compound quantitation and RLs adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors applicable to level IV validation?	✓			
XIII. Target compound identification				
Were relative retention times (RRT's) within ± 0.06 RRT units of the standard?	✓			
Did compound spectra meet specified EPA "Functional Guidelines" criteria?	✓			
Were chromatogram peaks verified and accounted for?	✓			
XIV. System performance				
System performance was found to be acceptable.	✓			
XV. Overall assessment of data				
Overall assessment of data was found to be acceptable.	✓			

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1. N-Nitrosodiethylamine
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1. N-Nitrosodi-n-butylamine
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1. N-Nitrosomethylethylamine
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1. N-Nitrosomorpholine
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1. N-Nitrosopyrrolidine
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1. Phenacetin
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1. 2-Acetylaminofluorene
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1. Pronamide
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1. Methyl methanesulfonate
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1. Ethyl methanesulfonate
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1. o,o',o''-Triethylphosphorothioate
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1. n-Phenylene diamine
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1. 1,4-Naphthoquinone
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1. N-Nitro-o-toluidine
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1. 1,3,5-Trinitrobenzene
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1. Pentachlorobenzene
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1. 4-Aminobiphenyl
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1. 2-Naphthylamine
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1. Triphenylene
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1. Octachlorostyrene
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU.. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1. Famphur
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1. 1,4-phenylenediamine
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW.. 2-Picoline	W1. Methapyrilene
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX. 3-Methylcholanthrene	X1. Pentachloroethane
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. a,a-Dimethylphenethylamine	Y1. 3,3'-Dimethylbenzidine
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ. Hexachloropropene	Z1. o-Toluidine

LDC #: 49590F2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

Blank extraction date: 9/28/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/1/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
	BII0750-BLK1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
CCC	3.00									
DDD	3.09									
GGG	4.70									
HHH	4.34									
III	4.90									
JJJ >	10.3	41.1/U	18.3/U			18.8/U		39.9/U	28.7/U	
KKK >	8.89	10.5/U	3.00/U	19.6/U	12.7/U	4.55/U	20.8/U	10.3/U	7.72/U	

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Calculation Verification

METHOD: GC/MS SVOC (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The Relative Response Factor (RRF), average RRF, and percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculations:

$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$
average RRF = sum of the RRFs/number of standards
%RSD = 100 * (S/X)

A_x = Area of compound,
C_x = Concentration of compound,
S = Standard deviation of the RRFs,

A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard
X = Mean of the RRFs

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Reported RRF (5 std)	Recalculated RRF (5 std)	Reported Average RRF (initial)	Recalculated Average RRF (initial)	Reported %RSD	Recalculated %RSD
1	ICAL	7/28/20	(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
			Chrysene (5th internal standard)	1.158585	1.158585	1.069113	1.069113	7.9	7.9
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)	1.021606	1.021606	0.9349588	0.9349588	10.9	10.9
2			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
			(5th internal standard)						
			(6th internal standard)						
3			(1st internal standard)						
			(2nd internal standard)						
			(3rd internal standard)						
			(4th internal standard)						
			(5th internal standard)						
			(6th internal standard)						

Comments: Refer to Initial Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49590Fba

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration Results Verification

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: GC/MS SVOCs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

The percent difference (%D) of the initial calibration average Relative Response Factors (RRFs) and the continuing calibration RRFs were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Difference = 100 * (ave. RRF - RRF)/ave. RRF
$RRF = (A_x)(C_{is})/(A_{is})(C_x)$

Where: ave. RRF = initial calibration average RRF
RRF = continuing calibration RRF
A_x = Area of compound, A_{is} = Area of associated internal standard
C_x = Concentration of compound, C_{is} = Concentration of internal standard

#	Standard ID	Calibration Date	Compound (Reference Internal Standard)	Average RRF (initial)	Reported RRF (CC)	Recalculated RRF (CC)	Reported %D	Recalculated %D
1	NT820100110	10/1/20	(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
			Chrysene (5th internal standard)	1.069113	0.9772343	0.977234	8.6	8.6
			Benzo(a)pyrene (6th internal standard)	0.9349588	0.8620084	0.8620083	7.8	7.8
2			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
			(5th internal standard)					
			(6th internal standard)					
3			(1st internal standard)					
			(2nd internal standard)					
			(3rd internal standard)					
			(4th internal standard)					
			(5th internal standard)					
			(6th internal standard)					

Comments: Refer to Continuing Calibration findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 14590-b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Surrogate Results Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270C-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) of surrogates were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery: SF/SS * 100

Where: SF = Surrogate Found
SS = Surrogate Spiked

Sample ID: 1

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
~~Nitrobenzene-d5~~ W-d10	3.0	2.14765	71.6	71.6	
2-Fluorobiphenyl kkk-d14	↓	3.39745	113	113	
~~Terphenyl-d14~~ YY-d10	↓	2.53895	84.6	84.6	

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					

Sample ID: _____

	Surrogate Spiked	Surrogate Found	Percent Recovery Reported	Percent Recovery Recalculated	Percent Difference
Nitrobenzene-d5					
2-Fluorobiphenyl					
Terphenyl-d14					

LDC #: 49590F36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SSC - SC)/SA Where: SSC = Spiked sample concentration; SA = Spike added; SC = Sample concentation

RPD = I MSC - MSC I * 2/(MSC + MSDC) MSC = Matrix spike concentration MSDC = Matrix spike duplicate concentration

MS/MSD samples: 9/10

Compound	Spike Added (µg/L)		Sample Concentration (µg/L)	Spiked Sample Concentration (µg/L)		Matrix Spike Percent Recovery		Matrix Spike Duplicate Percent Recovery		MS/MSD RPD	
	MS	MSD	------	MS	MSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Acenaphthene											
Pyrene											
111	300	300	35.0	258	277	74.5	74.3	80.7	80.7	6.94	7.10

Comments: Refer to Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49907b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates Results Verification

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

The percent recoveries (%R) and Relative Percent Difference (RPD) of the laboratory control sample and laboratory control sample duplicate were recalculated for the compounds identified below using the following calculation:

% Recovery = 100 * (SC/SA) Where: SSC = Spike concentration
SA = Spike added

RPD = I LCSC - LCSDC I * 2/(LCSC + LCSDC) LCSC = Laboratory control sample concentration LCSDC = Laboratory control sample duplicate concentration

LCS/LCSD samples: BI10TS0-BS1

Compound	Spike Added (µg/L)		Spike Concentration (µg/L)		LCS Percent Recovery		LCSD Percent Recovery		LCS/LCSD RPD	
	LCS	LCSD	LCS	LCSD	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalc	Reported	Recalculated
Acenaphthene										
Pyrene										
111	300	~~300~~ NA	183	~~185~~ NA	61.1	61.0	61.T	61.T	0.99T	1.1

Comments: Refer to Laboratory Control Sample/Laboratory Control Sample Duplicates findings worksheet for list of qualifications and associated samples when reported results do not agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results.

LDC #: 49570b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Sample Calculation Verification

Page: 6 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: GC/MS PAHs (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D-SIM)

Y N N/A Were all reported results recalculated and verified for all level IV samples?
Y N N/A Were all recalculated results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the reported results?

Concentration = $\frac{(A_x)(I_s)(V_t)(DF)(2.0)}{(A_{is})(RRF)(V_o)(V_i)(\%S)}$

A_x = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the compound to be measured

A_{is} = Area of the characteristic ion (EICP) for the specific internal standard

I_s = Amount of internal standard added in nanograms (ng)

V_o = Volume or weight of sample extract in milliliters (ml) or grams (g).

V_i = Volume of extract injected in microliters (ul)

V_t = Volume of the concentrated extract in microliters (ul)

Df = Dilution Factor.

%S = Percent solids, applicable to soil and solid matrices only.

2.0 = Factor of 2 to account for GPC cleanup

Example:

Sample I.D. 1, DDD:

Conc. = $\frac{(4962)(2.00)(500)(1)(\quad)}{(8262)(1.0691)(15.18)(0.6602)(\quad)}$

= 48.5 ng/g

#	Sample ID	Compound	Reported Concentration (ng/g)	Calculated Concentration ( )	Qualification
	1	DDD	48.5		

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0233

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC343	20I0233-01	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC160A	20I0233-02	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC160B	20I0233-03	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC210A	20I0233-04	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC204A	20I0233-05	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-IT315	20I0233-08	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC242A	20I0233-17	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC242B	20I0233-18	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC241A	20I0233-19	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC241B	20I0233-20	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229MS	20I0233-16MS	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229MSD	20I0233-16MSD	Sediment	06/19/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082A

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
09/03/20	SII0059-SCV1	2C	Aroclor-1260	21.5	All samples in SDG 20I0233	J (all detects)	A

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/01/20	20100119ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1248	23.8	LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC160B LDW20-SC210A LDW20-SC204A LDW20-IT315 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT360 LDW20-IT259	J (all detects)	A
10/01/20	20100135ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1248	31.4	LDW20-IT256 LDW20-IT233 LDW20-IT229 LDW20-SC242A LDW20-SC242B LDW20-SC241A LDW20-SC241B	J (all detects)	A

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

The sample results for detected compounds from the two columns were within 40% relative percent difference (RPD) with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC160A	Aroclor-1254	48.7	J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SC210A	Aroclor-1254	53.8	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to ICV %D, continuing calibration %D, and RPD between two columns, data were qualified as estimated in eighteen samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC343 LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC160B LDW20-SC210A LDW20-SC204A LDW20-IT315 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT360 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256 LDW20-IT233 LDW20-IT229 LDW20-SC242A LDW20-SC242B LDW20-SC241A LDW20-SC241B	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Initial calibration verification (%D)
LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC160B LDW20-SC210A LDW20-SC204A LDW20-IT315 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT360 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256 LDW20-IT233 LDW20-IT229 LDW20-SC242A LDW20-SC242B LDW20-SC241A LDW20-SC241B	Aroclor-1248	J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC210A	Aroclor-1254	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590F3b

SDG #: 20I0233

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: [illegible]

2nd Reviewer: [illegible]

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082A)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/SW	RSD ≤ 20%. ICV ≤ 20%
III.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS/D.
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC343	20I0233-01	Sediment	06/15/20
2	LDW20-SC160A	20I0233-02	Sediment	06/15/20
3	LDW20-SC160B	20I0233-03	Sediment	06/15/20
4	LDW20-SC210A	20I0233-04	Sediment	06/15/20
5	LDW20-SC204A	20I0233-05	Sediment	06/15/20
6	LDW20-IT315	20I0233-08	Sediment	06/18/20
7	LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
8	LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
9	LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
10	LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
11	LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
12	LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
13	LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
14	LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
15	LDW20-SC242A	20I0233-17	Sediment	06/19/20
16	LDW20-SC242B	20I0233-18	Sediment	06/19/20
17	LDW20-SC241A	20I0233-19	Sediment	06/19/20

LDC #: 49590F3b

SDG #: 20I0233

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: a

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082A)

18	LDW20-SC241B	20I0233-20	Sediment	06/19/20
19	LDW20-IT229MS	20I0233-16MS	Sediment	06/19/20
20	LDW20-IT229MSD	20I0233-16MSD	Sediment	06/19/20
21				
22				
23				

Notes:

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590A3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: √ GC ___ HPLC

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of initial calibration verification calculation was performed? ___%D or ___%R
Y N N/A Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each ICAL for each instrument?
Y N N/A Did the initial calibration verification standards meet the %D / %R validation criteria of ≤20.0% / 80-120%?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit ≤ 20.0)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	9/3/20	SII0059-SCN	2C	BB	21.5	All (dets)	Y/N/A
	10/1/20						

LDC #: 49590A3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q
2nd Reviewer: ______

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?

Y [✓ N] N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D validation criteria of ≤20.0%?

Level IV Only

Y ~~N~~ [✓ N/A] Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/1/20	20100119ZEDT	1C	Z	23.8	( )	2-11 (dets)	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		
	10/1/20	20100935ECD7	1C	Z	31.4	( )	12-20 (dets)	J/UJ/A
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 49590F3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: J

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Level IV/D Only

Y N N/A Were CRQLs adjusted for sample dilutions, dry weight factors, etc.?
Y N N/A Did the reported results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results?
Y N N/A Did the relative percent differences of detected compounds between two columns/detectors ≤40%?
If no, please see findings bellow.

#	Compound Name	Sample ID	%RPD Between Two Columns/Detectors Limit (≤ 40%)	Qualifications
	AA	2	48.7	J dets/A
	AA	4	53.8	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Arsenic

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0233

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Arsenic by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the method.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

The laboratory has indicated that there were no duplicate (DUP) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Arsenic - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590F4a

SDG #: 20I0233

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: Arsenic (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A, A	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	N	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	N	not reviewed
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	N	
XIV.	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
2	LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
3	LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0233

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC343	20I0233-01	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC160A	20I0233-02	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC160B	20I0233-03	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC210A	20I0233-04	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC204A	20I0233-05	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-IT315	20I0233-08	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC242A	20I0233-17	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC242B	20I0233-18	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC241A	20I0233-19	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC241B	20I0233-20	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC343DUP1	20I0233-01DUP1	Sediment	06/15/20
LDW20-SC343DUP2	20I0233-01DUP2	Sediment	06/15/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
PB (prep blank)	Total organic carbon	0.02%	LDW20-SC343 LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC160B LDW20-SC210A LDW20-SC204A LDW20-IT315 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.03%	LDW20-SC343 LDW20-SC160A LDW20-SC160B LDW20-SC210A LDW20-SC204A LDW20-IT315 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	LDW20-IT360 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256 LDW20-IT233 LDW20-IT229 LDW20-SC242A LDW20-SC242B LDW20-SC241A LDW20-SC241B

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590F6
SDG #: 20I0233
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/5/20
Page: 1 of 2
Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	N	CS
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC343	20I0233-01	Sediment	06/15/20
2	LDW20-SC160A	20I0233-02	Sediment	06/15/20
3	LDW20-SC160B	20I0233-03	Sediment	06/15/20
4	LDW20-SC210A	20I0233-04	Sediment	06/15/20
5	LDW20-SC204A	20I0233-05	Sediment	06/15/20
6	LDW20-IT315	20I0233-08	Sediment	06/18/20
7	LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
8	LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
9	LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
10	LDW20-IT360	20I0233-12	Sediment	06/18/20
11	LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
12	LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
13	LDW20-IT233	20I0233-15	Sediment	06/19/20
14	LDW20-IT229	20I0233-16	Sediment	06/19/20
15	LDW20-SC242A	20I0233-17	Sediment	06/19/20
16	LDW20-SC242B	20I0233-18	Sediment	06/19/20
17	LDW20-SC241A	20I0233-19	Sediment	06/19/20

LDC #: 49590F6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0233 Stage 2B Page: 2 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-SC241B	20I0233-20	Sediment	06/19/20
19	LDW20-SC343DUP 1	20I0233-01DUP 1	Sediment	06/15/20
20	LDW20-SC343~~TRP~~ DUP	20I0233-01~~TRP~~ DUP	Sediment	06/15/20
21				
22				
23				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 18	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
19, 20	total solids

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 1-9

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (%)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC	0.02	0.03	0.2									

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 10-18

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (%)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

LDC Report# 49590F21

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0233

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SS310	20I0233-06	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/20/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	57.3 ng/mL (45-56)	All samples in SDG 20I0233	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0365-BLK1	10/14/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDD	0.280 ng/Kg 1.78 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0233

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0233	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0233	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A
LDW20-IT259	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration, compounds reported as EMPC, and CDPE interference, data were qualified as estimated in six samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SS310 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	J (all detects) UJ (all non-detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-SS310 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-SS310 LDW20-IT305 LDW20-IT267 LDW20-IT260 LDW20-IT259 LDW20-IT256	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-IT259	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (CDPE interference)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0233

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590F21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/9/20
SDG #: 20I0233 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: 9
2nd Reviewer: R

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSDs 20/25%. ICV %Rs QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV %Rs QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	cs
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System performance	N	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SS310	20I0233-06	Sediment	06/18/20
2	LDW20-IT305	20I0233-09	Sediment	06/18/20
3	LDW20-IT267	20I0233-10	Sediment	06/18/20
4	LDW20-IT260	20I0233-11	Sediment	06/18/20
5	LDW20-IT259	20I0233-13	Sediment	06/19/20
6	LDW20-IT256	20I0233-14	Sediment	06/19/20
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590F3

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?
Y N N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?
Y N N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) ~~Finding %D~~	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/20/20	20102002	O	58.2 (45-55)		MB	J/M/P
	10/20/20	20102016	K	57.3 (45-56)		All (det+ND)	J/M/P

V:\VALIDATION WORKSHEETS\DIOXINS\1613\CONCAL.DOCX

LDC #: 49590F21

VALIDATION FINDINGS WOR/UHEET
Blanks

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/14/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/20/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0365-BLK1	5X											
F	0.280	1.4											
G	1.78	8.9											

LDC #: 49590F3

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: PG

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N (N/A) Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N (N/A) Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
		5	All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl either interference		Jdets/A

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-SC380	20I0239-13	Sediment	06/23/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G2a

SDG #: 20I0239

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer:

2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: GC/MS Semivolatiles (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD ≤ 20%. %D ≤ 30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV ≤ 20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CG
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-SC380	20I0239-13	Sediment	06/23/20
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Semivolatiles

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT302	20I0239-03	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-IT323	20I0239-04	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-IT313	20I0239-05	Sediment	06/23/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Semivolatile Organic Compounds (SVOCs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8270E in Selected Ion Monitoring (SIM) mode

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. GC/MS Instrument Performance Check

A decafluorotriphenylphosphine (DFTPP) tune was performed at 12 hour intervals.

All ion abundance requirements were met.

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

For compounds where average relative response factors (RRFs) were utilized, percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0%.

In the case where the laboratory used a calibration curve to evaluate the compounds, all coefficients of determination (r^2) were greater than or equal to 0.990.

Average relative response factors (RRF) for all compounds were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 30.0% for all compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/06/20	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	30.4 30.2	All samples in SDG 20I0239	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

All of the continuing calibration relative response factors (RRF) were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BII0800-BLK1	09/30/20	Benzo(a)anthracene Chrysene Benzo(b)fluoranthene Benzo(k)fluoranthene Benzo(a)pyrene Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	1.10 ug/Kg 1.11 ug/Kg 2.07 ug/Kg 2.02 ug/Kg 2.09 ug/Kg 4.91 ug/Kg 4.56 ug/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0239

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Reported Concentration	Modified Final Concentration
LDW20-IT313	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	2.91 ug/Kg	2.91U ug/Kg

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Surrogates

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VIII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

IX. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

X. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XI. Internal Standards

All internal standard areas and retention times were within QC limits.

XII. Compound Quantitation

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration %D, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

Due to laboratory blank contamination, data were qualified as not detected in one sample.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles – Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT227 LDW20-IT302 LDW20-IT323 LDW20-IT313	Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

Sample	Compound	Modified Final Concentration	A or P
LDW20-IT313	Dibenzo(a,h)anthracene	2.91U ug/Kg	A

Duwamish AOC4
Semivolatiles - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G2b

SDG #: 20I0239

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET

Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20

Page: 1 of 1

Reviewer: 9

2nd Reviewer: AC

METHOD: GC/MS Polynuclear Aromatic Hydrocarbons (EPA SW 846 Method 8270E-SIM)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	GC/MS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD≤20%, r²≥0.99 ICV≤30%
IV.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV≤20%
V.	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Surrogate spikes	A	
VIII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
IX.	Laboratory control samples / SRM	A/A	LCS
X.	Field duplicates	N	
XI.	Internal standards	A	
XII.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XIII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIV.	System performance	N	
XV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
2	LDW20-IT302	20I0239-03	Sediment	06/22/20
3	LDW20-IT323	20I0239-04	Sediment	06/22/20
4	LDW20-IT313	20I0239-05	Sediment	06/23/20
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Notes:

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: GC/MS SVOA

A. Phenol	AA. 2-Chloronaphthalene	AAA. Butylbenzylphthalate	AAAA. Dibenzothiophene	A1.Dibenz(a,h)+(a,c)anthracene
B. Bis (2-chloroethyl) ether	BB. 2-Nitroaniline	BBB. 3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	BBBB. Benzo(a)fluoranthene	B1.Benzo(j)fluoranthene
C. 2-Chlorophenol	CC. Dimethylphthalate	CCC. Benzo(a)anthracene	CCCC. Benzo(b)fluorene	C1.Benzo(b)naphtho(2,1-d)thiophene
D. 1,3-Dichlorobenzene	DD. Acenaphthylene	DDD. Chrysene	DDDD. cis/trans-Decalin	D1.
E. 1,4-Dichlorobenzene	EE. 2,6-Dinitrotoluene	EEE. Bis(2-ethylhexyl)phthalate	EEEE. Biphenyl	E1.
F. 1,2-Dichlorobenzene	FF. 3-Nitroaniline	FFF. Di-n-octylphthalate	FFFF. Retene	F1.
G. 2-Methylphenol	GG. Acenaphthene	GGG. Benzo(b)fluoranthene	GGGG. C30-Hopane	G1.
H. 2,2'-Oxybis(1-chloropropane)	HH. 2,4-Dinitrophenol	HHH. Benzo(k)fluoranthene	HHHH. 1-Methylphenanthrene	H1.
I. 4-Methylphenol	II. 4-Nitrophenol	III. Benzo(a)pyrene	IIII. 1,4-Dioxane	I1.
J. N-Nitroso-di-n-propylamine	JJ. Dibenzofuran	JJJ. Indeno(1,2,3-cd)pyrene	JJJJ. Acetophenone	J1.
K. Hexachloroethane	KK. 2,4-Dinitrotoluene	KKK. Dibenz(a,h)anthracene	KKKK. Atrazine	K1.
L. Nitrobenzene	LL. Diethylphthalate	LLL. Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	LLLL. Benzaldehyde	L1.
M. Isophorone	MM. 4-Chlorophenyl-phenyl ether	MMM. Bis(2-Chloroisopropyl)ether	MMMM. Caprolactam	M1.
N. 2-Nitrophenol	NN. Fluorene	NNN. Aniline	NNNN. 2,6-Dichlorophenol	N1.
O. 2,4-Dimethylphenol	OO. 4-Nitroaniline	OOO. N-Nitrosodimethylamine	OOOO. 1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	O1.
P. Bis(2-chloroethoxy)methane	PP. 4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	PPP. Benzoic Acid	PPPP. 3-Methylphenol	P1.
Q. 2,4-Dichlorophenol	QQ. N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	QQQ. Benzyl alcohol	QQQQ. 3&4-Methylphenol	Q1.
R. 1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	RR. 4-Bromophenyl-phenylether	RRR. Pyridine	RRRR. 4-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	R1.
S. Naphthalene	SS. Hexachlorobenzene	SSS. Benzidine	SSSS. 2/3-Dimethyldibenzothiophene (4MDT)	S1.
T. 4-Chloroaniline	TT. Pentachlorophenol	TTT. 1-Methylnaphthalene	TTTT. 1-Methyldibenzothiophene (1MDT)	T1.
U. Hexachlorobutadiene	UU. Phenanthrene	UUU.Benzo(b)thiophene	UUUU. 2,3,4,6-Tetrachlorophenol	U1.
V. 4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	VV. Anthracene	VVV.Benzonaphthothiophene	VVVV. 1,2,4,5-Tetrachlorobenzene	V1.
W. 2-Methylnaphthalene	WW. Carbazole	WWW.Benzo(e)pyrene	WWWW. Chrysene/Triphenylene	W1.
X. Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	XX. Di-n-butylphthalate	XXX. 2,6-Dimethylnaphthalene	XXXX.Benzo(j)+(k)fluoranthene	X1.
Y. 2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	YY. Fluoranthene	YYY. 2,3,5-Trimethylnaphthalene	YYYY. Naphthobenzophiophene	Y1.
Z. 2,4,5-Trichlorophenol	ZZ. Pyrene	ZZZ. Perylene	ZZZZ.Benzofluoranthenes, Total	Z1.

LDC #: 49590F2b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

~~N~~ N/A Was a continuing calibration standard analyzed at least once every 12 hours for each instrument?

Y ~~N~~ N/A Were percent differences (%D) ≤20 % and relative response factors (RRF) within the method criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	Finding %D (Limit: ≤20.0%)	Finding RRF (Limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/6/20	NT830100617	WN	30.4		All (dets)	Y/WN/A
			KKK	30.2			d

LDC #: 49590

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Blanks

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q

METHOD: GC/MS BNA (EPA SW 846 Method 8270D)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each matrix?
Y N N/A Was a method blank analyzed for each concentration preparation level?
Y N N/A Was a method blank associated with every sample?
Y N N/A Was the blank contaminated? If yes, please see qualification below.

Blank extraction date: 9/30/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/6/20
Conc. units: ug/kg Associated Samples: All

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								
BIII	0800-BK1	4								
CCC	1.10									
DDD	1.11									
EEE	2.07									
HHH	2.02									
III	2.09									
JJJ	4.91									
KKK	4.56		2.91/U							

Blank extraction date: _____ **Blank analysis date:** _____
Conc. units: _____ Associated Samples: _____

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification								

CIRCLED RESULTS WERE NOT QUALIFIED. ALL RESULTS NOT CIRCLED WERE QUALIFIED BY THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT:
Common contaminants such as the phthalates and TICs noted above that were detected in samples within ten times the associated method blank concentration were qualified as not detected, "U". Other contaminants within five times the method blank concentration were also qualified as not detected, "U".

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 16, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Biphenyls

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT221	20I0239-02	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SS400	20I0239-09	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS425	20I0239-10	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS242	20I0239-12	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC209	20I0239-16	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC213A	20I0239-17	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC205B	20I0239-18	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT221MS	20I0239-02MS	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT221MSD	20I0239-02MSD	Sediment	06/19/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Organic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 8082A

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

An initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
09/03/20	SII0059-SCV1	2C	Aroclor-1260	21.5	All samples in SDG 20I0239	J (all detects)	A

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at required frequencies.

The percent differences (%D) were less than or equal to 20.0% for all compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Standard	Column	Compound	%D	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/07/20	20100725ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1260	35.4	LDW20-SC206 LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS425 LDW20-SS225 LDW20-SS242 LDW20-SC209 LDW20-SC213A LDW20-SC205B	J (all detects)	A
10/08/20	20100803ECD7	1C	Aroclor-1260	27.3	LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311	J (all detects)	A

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Surrogates/Internal Standards

Surrogates were added to all samples as required by the method. All surrogate recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control samples duplicates (LCSD) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits with the following exceptions:

SRM ID	Compound	%R (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
BIJ0067-SRM1	Aroclor-1260	168 (38-167)	All samples in SDG 20I0239	J (all detects)	P

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Compound Quantitation

The sample results for detected compounds from the two columns were within 40% relative percent difference (RPD) with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS400	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	41.0 45.3	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A
LDW20-SS425	Aroclor-1254	44.4	J (all detects)	A

Sample	Compound	RPD	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SS225	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	41.3 43.5	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Target Compound Identification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to ICV %D, continuing calibration %D, SRM %R, and RPD between two columns, data were qualified as estimated in fourteen samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT227 LDW20-IT221 LDW20-SC225A LDW20-SC225B LDW20-SC206 LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS425 LDW20-SS225 LDW20-SS242 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311 LDW20-SC209 LDW20-SC213A LDW20-SC205B	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Initial calibration verification (%D)
LDW20-SC206 LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS425 LDW20-SS225 LDW20-SS242 LDW20-SC209 LDW20-SC213A LDW20-SC205B LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	A	Continuing calibration (%D)
LDW20-IT227 LDW20-IT221 LDW20-SC225A LDW20-SC225B LDW20-SC206 LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS425 LDW20-SS225 LDW20-SS242 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311 LDW20-SC209 LDW20-SC213A LDW20-SC205B	Aroclor-1260	J (all detects)	P	Standard reference materials (%R)
LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS225	Aroclor-1254 Aroclor-1260	J (all detects) J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)
LDW20-SS425	Aroclor-1254	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (RPD between two columns)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Biphenyls - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G3b
SDG #: 20I0239
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET
Stage 2B

Date: 11/9/20
Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: A
2nd Reviewer: A

METHOD: GC Polychlorinated Biphenyls (EPA SW846 Method 8082A)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/SW	RSD ≤ 20%. RF ≤ 20%
III.	Continuing calibration	SW	CCV ≤ 20%
IV.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
V.	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Surrogate spikes /TS	A/A	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A/SW	LCS/D
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Compound quantitation/RL/LOQ/LODs	N	
XI.	Target compound identification	N	
XII.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
2	LDW20-IT221	20I0239-02	Sediment	06/19/20
3	LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
4	LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
5	LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
6 ✓	LDW20-SS400	20I0239-09	Sediment	06/23/20
7	LDW20-SS425	20I0239-10	Sediment	06/23/20
8 ✓	LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
9	LDW20-SS242	20I0239-12	Sediment	06/23/20
10	LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
11	LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20
12	LDW20-SC209	20I0239-16	Sediment	06/23/20
13	LDW20-SC213A	20I0239-17	Sediment	06/23/20
14	LDW20-SC205B	20I0239-18	Sediment	06/23/20
15	LDW20-IT221MS	20I0239-02MS	Sediment	06/19/20
16	LDW20-IT221MSD	20I0239-02MSD	Sediment	06/19/20
17				

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: Pesticides

A. alpha-BHC	K. Endrin	U. Toxaphene	EE. 2,4'-DDT	OO. oxy-Chlordane
B. beta-BHC	L. Endosulfan II	V. Aroclor-1016	FF. Hexachlorobenzene	PP. cis-Nonachlor
C. delta-BHC	M. 4,4'-DDD	W. Aroclor-1221	GG. Chlordane	QQ. trans-Nonachlor
D. gamma-BHC	N. Endosulfan sulfate	X. Aroclor-1232	HH. Chlordane (Technical)	RR. cis-Chlordane
E. Heptachlor	O. 4,4'-DDT	Y. Aroclor-1242	II. p,p'-DDE	SS. trans-Chlordane
F. Aldrin	P. Methoxychlor	Z. Aroclor-1248	JJ. p,p'-DDD	TT. alpha-Endosulphan
G. Heptachlor epoxide	Q. Endrin ketone	AA. Aroclor-1254	KK. p,p'-DDT	UU. beta-Endosulphan
H. Endosulfan I	R. Endrin aldehyde	BB. Aroclor-1260	LL. o,p'-DDT	VV. Endosulphan Sulphate
I. Dieldrin	S. alpha-Chlordane	CC. 2,4'-DDD	MM. o,p'-DDE	WW. Mirex
J. 4,4'-DDE	T. gamma-Chlordane	DD. 2,4'-DDE	NN. o,p'-DDD	

Notes:_____

LDC #: 19590f36

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Initial Calibration Verification

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 9
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

METHOD: √ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".
What type of initial calibration verification calculation was performed? __%D or __%R
Y N N/A Was an initial calibration verification standard analyzed after each ICAL for each instrument?
Y N N/A Did the initial calibration verification standards meet the %D / %R validation criteria of ≤20.0% / 80-120%?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit ≤ 20.0)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	9/3/20	SII0059-SCV1	2C	BB	21.5	All (dets)	J/UH/A

LDC #: 14590G36

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: a
~~2nd Reviewer:~~

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Were continuing calibration standards analyzed at the required frequencies?

Y (N) N/A Did the continuing calibration standards meet the %D validation criteria of ≤20.0%?

Level IV Only

Y N (N/A) Were the retention times for all calibrated compounds within their respective acceptance windows?

#	Date	Standard ID	Detector/ Column	Compound	%D (Limit)	RT (limit)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/7/20	20100705ECD1	1C	~~35.4~~ BB	35.4	( )	5-9. 12-14 (dots)	✓/(N)/A
						( )		
						( )		
	10/9/20	20100847ECD1	1C	BB	26.4	( )	15-16 (dots)	✓/(N)/A
						( )		
						( )		
	10/8/20	20100803ECD1	1C	BB	27.3	( )	10-11 (dots)	✓/(N)/A
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		
						( )		

LDC #: 19590G3b

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Control Samples (LCS)

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: Q
~~2nd Reviewer:~~ ______

METHOD: ✓ **GC** __ **HPLC**

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

[✓ Y] N N/A Were a laboratory control samples (LCS) and laboratory control sample duplicate (LCSD) analyzed for each matrix in this SDG?

[✓ Y] N N/A Were the LCS percent recoveries (%R) and relative percent differences (RPD) within the QC limits?

Level ~~IV~~/D Only

Y N [✓ N/A] Was an LCS analyzed every 20 samples for each matrix or whenever a sample extraction was performed?

#	LCS/LCSD ID	Compound	LCS %R (Limits)	LCSD %R (Limits)	RPD (Limits)	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	BE10067-SRM1	BB	168 (38-167)	( )	( )	All (dets)	J dets/P
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		
			( )	( )	( )		

LDC #: 49710636

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported CRQLs

Page: 1 of 1
Reviewer: 2

METHOD: ✓ GC __ HPLC

Level IV/D Only

Y N N/A Were CRQLs adjusted for sample dilutions, dry weight factors, etc.?
Y N N/A Did the reported results for detected target compounds agree within 10.0% of the recalculated results?
Y N N/A Did the relative percent differences of detected compounds between two columns/detectors ≤40%?
If no, please see findings bellow.

#	Compound Name	Sample ID	%RPD Between Two Columns/Detectors Limit (≤ 40%)	Qualifications
	AA	6	41.0	Note A
	BB		45.3	
	AA	7	44.4	
	AA	8	41.3	
	BB		43.5	

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 23, 2020

Parameters: Metals

Validation Level: Stage 2B & 4

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC225AMS	20I0239-06MS	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC225AMSD	20I0239-06MSD	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC225ADUP	20I0239-06DUP	Sediment	06/22/20

Mercury underwent Stage 2B validation

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Arsenic, Cadmium, Chromium, Copper, Lead, Silver, and Zinc by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 6020A
Mercury by EPA SW 846 Method 7471B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results. Samples appended with a double asterisk on the cover page were subjected to Stage 4 data validation, which is comprised of the QC summary forms as well as the raw data, to confirm sample quantitation and identification.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met with the following exceptions:

Sample	Analyte	Total Days From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Required Holding Time (in Days) From Sample Collection Until Analysis	Flag	A or P
LDW20-SC225A LDW20-SC225B LDW20-SC225ADUP	Mercury	105	28	J (all detects)	P
LDW20-SS225	Mercury	104	28	J (all detects)	P

II. ICPMS Tune

The mass calibration was within 0.1 AMU and the percent relative standard deviation (%RSD) was less than or equal to 5%.

III. Instrument Calibration

Initial and continuing calibrations were performed as required by the methods.

The initial calibration verification (ICV) and continuing calibration verification (CCV) standards were within QC limits.

IV. ICP Interference Check Sample Analysis

The frequency of interference check sample (ICS) analysis was met. All criteria were within QC limits.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VIII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

IX. Serial Dilution

Serial dilution was not performed for this SDG.

X. Laboratory Control Samples

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XI. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

XII. Internal Standards (ICP-MS)

All internal standard percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

XIII. Sample Result Verification

All sample result verifications were acceptable for samples which underwent Stage 4 validation. Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to technical holding time, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

Sample	Analyte	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-SC225A LDW20-SC225B LDW20-SC225ADUP LDW20-SS225	Mercury	J (all detects)	P	Technical holding times

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Metals - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G4a **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20

SDG #: 20I0239 Stage 4 (6020A) / 2B (7471B) Page: 1 of 1

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: G

2nd Reviewer: G

METHOD: Metals (EPA SW 846 Method 6020A/7471B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A ~~A~~ SW	
II.	ICP/MS Tune	A	
III.	Instrument Calibration	A	
IV.	ICP Interference Check Sample (ICS) Analysis	A	
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field Blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VIII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
IX.	Serial Dilution	N	
X.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS
XI.	Field Duplicates	N	
XII.	Internal Standard (ICP-MS)	A	
XIII.	Sample Result Verification	A	not reviewed for Stage 2B
XIV.	Overall Assessment of Data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

Stage 4 for 6020A only

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
2	LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
3	LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
4	LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
5	LDW20-SC225AMS	20I0239-06MS	Sediment	06/22/20
6	LDW20-SC225AMSD	20I0239-06MSD	Sediment	06/22/20
7	LDW20-SC225ADUP	20I0239-06DUP	Sediment	06/22/20
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				

Notes:

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
I. Technical holding times				
Were all technical holding times met?	X			for method 6020A
Were all water samples preserved to a pH of <2.			X	
II. ICP-MS Tune				
Were mass resolutions within 0.1 amu for all isotopes in the tuning solution?	X			
Were %RSDs of isoptoes in the tuning solution ≤5%?	X			
III. Calibration				
Were all instuments calibrated daily?	X			
Were the proper standards used?	X			
Were all initial and continuing calibration verifications within the 90-110% (80-120% for mercury) QC limits?	X			
Were the low level standard checks within 70-130%?	X			
Were all initial calibration correlation coefficients within limits as specifed by the method?	X			
IV. Blanks				
Was a method blank associated with every sample in this SDG?	X			
Was there contamination in the method blanks?		X		
Was there contamination in the initial and continuing calibration blanks?		X		
V. Interference Check Sample				
Were the interference check samples performed daily?	X			
Were the AB solution recoveries within 80-120%?	X			
VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates/Laboratory Duplicates				
Were MS/MSD recoveries with the QC limits? (If the sample concentration exceeded the spike concentration by a factor of 4, no action was taken.)			X	
Were the MS/MSD or laboratory duplicate relative percent differences (RPDs) within the QC limits?			X	
VII. Laboratory Control Samples				
Was a LCS analyzed for each batch in the SDG?	X			
Were the LCS recoveries and RPDs (if applicable) within QC limits?	X			

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)				
Validation Area	**Yes**	**No**	**NA**	**Comments**
VIII. Internal Standards				
Were all percent recoveries within the 30-120% (60-125% for EPA Method 200.8) QC limits?	X			
If the recoveries were outside the limits, was a reanalysis performed?			X	
IX. Serial Dilution				
Were all percent differences <10%?			X	
Was there evidence of negative interference? If yes, professional judgement will be used to qualify the data.			X	
X. Sample Result Verification				
Were all reporting limits adjusted to reflect sample dilutions?	X			
Were all soil samples dry weight corrected?	X			
XI. Overall Assessment of Data				
Was the overall assessment of the data found to be acceptable?	X			
XII. Field Duplicates				
Were field duplicates identifed in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field duplicates?			X	
XIII. Field Blanks				
Were field blanks identified in this SDG?		X		
Were target analytes detected in the field blanks?			X	

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
2 to 4	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn, Hg
1	As
QC: 5-7	Hg

Analysis Method

ICP	
ICP-MS	As, Cd, Cr, Cu, Pb, Ag, Zn
CVAA	Hg

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

All samples were properly preserved (water samples to a pH of <2) and analyzed within the required holding time with the following exceptions.

Method:		Mercury by 7471B, HT = 28 days			
Sample ID	Sampling Date	Analysis Date	Total Time from Collection to Analysis (Days)	Qualifier	Det/ND
~~2,4,7~~2,3,5,7	6/22/2020	10/5/2020	105	J/R/P	Det
4	6/23/2020	10/5/2020	104	J/R/P	Det

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

An intial calibration verification (ICV), continuing calibration verification (CCV), low level calibration check (LLCC), and interference check sample (ICSAB) percent recovery (%R) was recalculated for each type of analysis using the following formula:

%R = (Found/True) x 100

Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis

True = concentration of each analyte in the source

Standard ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found (ug/L)	True (ug/L)	Recalcuated %R	Reported %R	Acceptable (Y/N)
ICV	ICP-MS	Cu	51.2	50	102	102	
CCV	ICP-MS	Pb	50.9	50	102	102	
ICSAB	ICP-MS	Cd	19.44	20	97.2	97.2	

ICP-MS Tune	QC Parameter	Mass	Actual	Required
10/1/2020	Mass Axis	In	114.9	± 0.1 amu
10/1/2020	%RSD	In	0.9	≤ 5%

Quality Control Sample Recalculations

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

Percent recoveries (%R) for the laboratory control sample (LCS), matrix spike (MS), and post digestion spike (PDS) were recalculated using the following formula:

%R = (Found/True) x 100

Found = concentration of each analyte measured in the analysis. For the MS calculation, Found = SSR (Spiked Sample Result) - SR (Sample Result)

True = concentration of each analyte in the source

The sample and duplicate relative percent difference (RPD) was recalculated using the following formula:

RPD = (Absolute value(S-D)x 200) / (S+D)

S = Original sample concentration

D = Duplicate sample concentration

The serial dilution percent difference (%D) was recalculated using the following formula.

%D = (Absolute value (I - SDR)) x 100 / (I)

I = Initial sample result

SDR = Serial dilution result (with a 5x dilution applied)

Sample ID	Type of Analysis	Element	Found/S/I	True/D/SDR	Recalcuated %R/RPD/%D	Reported %R/RPD/%D	Acceptable (Y/N)
LCS	LCS	Ag	26.3	25	105	105	Y
	MS						
	Duplicate						
	PDS						
	Serial dilution						

VALIDATION FINDINGS CHECKLIST

Sample Calculation Verification

Reviewer:

METHOD: Trace Metals (EPA SW 846 Methods 6010/6020/7000)

Analytes were recalculated and verified using the following equation:

Concentration = (Result from raw data x Final volume x Dilution factor) / (Percent solids x Initial weight)

Sample ID	Analyte	Raw Data (unit)	Dilution	Initial Weight/ Volume (g)	Final Volume (mL)	Percent solids (%)	Reported Result (mg/Kg)	Recalcuated Result (mg/Kg)	Acceptable (Y/N)
1	As	13.002	20	1.059	50	60.01	20.5	20.5	Y
2	Cr	12.003	20	1.034	50	55.13	21.1	21.1	Y
3	Zn	53.604	20	1.039	50	52.74	97.8	97.8	Y
4	Cd	0.089	20	1.048	50	52.83	0.16	0.16	Y

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 9, 2020

Parameters: Wet Chemistry

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT221	20I0239-02	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SS400	20I0239-09	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS425	20I0239-10	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SS242	20I0239-12	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC380	20I0239-13	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC209	20I0239-16	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC213A	20I0239-17	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-SC205B	20I0239-18	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT227MS	20I0239-01MS	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT227MSD	20I0239-01MSD	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT227DUP1	20I0239-01DUP1	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-IT227DUP2	20I0239-01DUP2	Sediment	06/19/20
LDW20-SC225BDUP	20I0239-07DUP	Sediment	06/22/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for Inorganic Superfund Methods Data Review (January 2017). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following methods:

Total Organic Carbon by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) SW 846 Method 9060A
Total Solids by Standard Method 2540G

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered non-detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. Initial Calibration

All criteria for the initial calibration of each method were met.

III. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration frequency and analysis criteria were met for each method when applicable.

IV. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the methods. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Analyte	Maximum Concentration	Associated Samples
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.25%	LDW20-SC225A LDW20-SC225B LDW20-SC206 LDW20-SS400 LDW20-SS425 LDW20-SS225 LDW20-SS242 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311 LDW20-SC209 LDW20-SC213A LDW20-SC205B
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.03%	LDW20-IT221
ICB/CCB	Total organic carbon	0.02%	LDW20-IT227 LDW20-SC380

Data qualification by the laboratory blanks was based on the maximum contaminant concentration in the laboratory blanks in the analysis of each analyte. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

V. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VI. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

Matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits. Relative percent differences (RPD) were within QC limits.

VII. Duplicate Sample Analysis

Duplicate (DUP) sample analysis was performed on an associated project sample. Results were within QC limits.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the methods. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the methods. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Sample Result Verification

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XI. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the methods. No results were rejected in this SDG.

The quality control criteria reviewed were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Wet Chemistry - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0239 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer: G
2nd Reviewer: A

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A/A	
II	Initial calibration	A	
III.	Calibration verification	A	
IV	Laboratory Blanks	SW	
V	Field blanks	N	
VI.	Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates	A	
VII.	Duplicate sample analysis	A	
VIII.	Laboratory control samples	A	LCS, SRM
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Sample result verification	N	
XI	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable; N = Not provided/applicable; SW = See worksheet; ND = No compounds detected; R = Rinsate; FB = Field blank; D = Duplicate; TB = Trip blank; EB = Equipment blank; SB=Source blank; OTHER:

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT227	20I0239-01	Sediment	06/19/20
2	LDW20-IT221	20I0239-02	Sediment	06/19/20
3				
4				
5				
6	LDW20-SC225A	20I0239-06	Sediment	06/22/20
7	LDW20-SC225B	20I0239-07	Sediment	06/22/20
8	LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
9	LDW20-SS400	20I0239-09	Sediment	06/23/20
10	LDW20-SS425	20I0239-10	Sediment	06/23/20
11	LDW20-SS225	20I0239-11	Sediment	06/23/20
12	LDW20-SS242	20I0239-12	Sediment	06/23/20
13	LDW20-SC380	20I0239-13	Sediment	06/23/20
14	LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
15	LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20
16	LDW20-SC209	20I0239-16	Sediment	06/23/20
17	LDW20-SC213A	20I0239-17	Sediment	06/23/20

LDC #: 49590G6 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/5/20
SDG #: 20I0239 Stage 2B Page: 2 of 2
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer:

METHOD: (Analyte) TOC (EPA SW846 9060A), Total Solids (SM 2540G)

18	LDW20-SC205B	20I0239-18	Sediment	06/23/20
19	LDW20-IT227MS	20I0239-01MS	Sediment	06/19/20
20	LDW20-IT227MSD	20I0239-01MSD	Sediment	06/19/20
21	LDW20-IT227DUP 1	20I0239-01DUP 1	Sediment	06/19/20
22	LDW20-IT227~~TRP~~ DUP	20I0239-01~~TRP~~ D.Pa	Sediment	06/19/20
23	LDW20-SC225BDUP	20I0239-07DUP	Sediment	06/22/20
24				
25				
26				

Notes:

All elements are applicable to each sample as noted below.

Sample ID	Target Analyte List
1 to 18	Total solids, TOC
QC:	
19, 20	TOC
21	Total solids
22	Total solids
23	Total solids

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Laboratory Blank Contamination (PB/ICB/CCB)

METHOD: Inorganics
Soil preparation factor applied (if applicable):

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 6-12, 14-18

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (%)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.25	0.25									

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 2

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (%)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.03	0.03									

Sample Concentration, unless otherwise noted: % Associated Samples: 1, 13

				Sample Identification								
Analyte	**PB (%)**	**Maximum ICB/CCB (%)**	**Action Level**	No qual								
TOC		0.02	0.02									

Comments: The listed analyte concentrtaion is the highest ICB or CCB detected in the analysis. The action level, when applicable, is establisec

LDC Report# 49590G21

Laboratory Data Consultants, Inc.
Data Validation Report

Project/Site Name: Duwamish AOC4

LDC Report Date: November 11, 2020

Parameters: Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans

Validation Level: Stage 2B

Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc.

Sample Delivery Group (SDG): 20I0239

Sample Identification	Laboratory Sample Identification	Matrix	Collection Date
LDW20-IT302	20I0239-03	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20

Introduction

This Data Validation Report (DVR) presents data validation findings and results for the associated samples listed on the cover page. Data validation was performed in accordance with the Final Lower Duwamish Waterway Quality Assurance Project Plan for Remedial Design of Upper Reach: Pre-Design Investigation (May 2020) and a modified outline of the USEPA National Functional Guidelines (NFG) for High Resolution Superfund Methods Data Review (April 2016). Where specific guidance was not available, the data has been evaluated in a conservative manner consistent with industry standards using professional experience.

The analyses were performed by the following method:

Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans by Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Method 1613B

All sample results were subjected to Stage 2B data validation, which comprises an evaluation of quality control (QC) summary results.

The following are definitions of the data qualifiers utilized during data validation:

J (Estimated): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the reported concentration is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

U (Non-detected): The compound or analyte was analyzed for and positively identified by the laboratory; however the compound or analyte should be considered not detected at the reported concentration due to the presence of contaminants detected in the associated blank(s).

UJ (Non-detected estimated): The compound or analyte was reported as not detected by the laboratory; however the reported quantitation/detection limit is estimated due to non-conformances discovered during data validation.

R (Rejected): The sample results were rejected due to gross non-conformances discovered during data validation. Data qualified as rejected is not usable.

NA (Not Applicable): The non-conformance discovered during data validation demonstrates a high bias, while the affected compound or analyte in the associated sample(s) was reported as not detected by the laboratory and did not warrant the qualification of the data.

A qualification summary table is provided at the end of this report if data has been qualified. Flags are classified as P (protocol) or A (advisory) to indicate whether the flag is due to a laboratory deviation from a specified protocol or is of technical advisory nature.

I. Sample Receipt and Technical Holding Times

All samples were received in good condition and cooler temperatures upon receipt met validation criteria.

All technical holding time requirements were met.

II. HRGC/HRMS Instrument Performance Check

Instrument performance was checked at the required frequency.

Retention time windows were established for all homologues. The chromatographic resolution between 2,3,7,8-TCDD and peaks representing any other unlabeled TCDD isomer was less than or equal to 25%.

The static resolving power was at least 10,000 (10% valley definition).

III. Initial Calibration and Initial Calibration Verification

A five point initial calibration was performed as required by the method.

The percent relative standard deviations (%RSD) were less than or equal to 20.0% for unlabeled compounds and less than or equal to 35.0% for labeled compounds.

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

The percent differences (%D) of the initial calibration verification (ICV) standard were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds.

IV. Continuing Calibration

Continuing calibration was performed at the required frequencies.

All of the continuing calibration results were within the QC limits for unlabeled compounds and labeled compounds with the following exceptions:

Date	Compound	Concentration (Limits)	Associated Samples	Flag	A or P
10/20/20	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	57.3 ng/mL (45-56)	All samples in SDG 20I0239	J (all detects)	P

The ion abundance ratios for all PCDDs and PCDFs were within validation criteria.

V. Laboratory Blanks

Laboratory blanks were analyzed as required by the method. No contaminants were found in the laboratory blanks with the following exceptions:

Blank ID	Extraction Date	Compound	Concentration	Associated Samples
BIJ0365-BLK1	10/14/20	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDD	0.280 ng/Kg 1.78 ng/Kg	All samples in SDG 20I0239

Sample concentrations were compared to concentrations detected in the laboratory blanks. The sample concentrations were either not detected or were significantly greater than the concentrations found in the associated laboratory blanks.

VI. Field Blanks

No field blanks were identified in this SDG.

VII. Matrix Spike/Matrix Spike Duplicates

The laboratory has indicated that there were no matrix spike (MS) and matrix spike duplicate (MSD) analyses specified for the samples in this SDG, and therefore matrix spike and matrix spike duplicate analyses were not performed for this SDG.

VIII. Laboratory Control Samples/Standard Reference Materials

Laboratory control samples (LCS) were analyzed as required by the method. Percent recoveries (%R) were within QC limits.

Standard reference materials (SRM) were analyzed as required by the method. The results were within QC limits.

IX. Field Duplicates

No field duplicates were identified in this SDG.

X. Labeled Compounds

All percent recoveries (%R) for labeled compounds used to quantitate target compounds were within QC limits.

XI. Compound Quantitation

All compound quantitations were within validation criteria with the following exceptions:

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0239	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P
All samples in SDG 20I0239	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A
LDW20-IT302	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A

Sample	Compound	Finding	Criteria	Flag	A or P
LDW20-IT302	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDF OCDD	Sample result exceeded calibration range.	Reported result should be within calibration range.	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	P

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XII. Target Compound Identifications

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIII. System Performance

Raw data were not reviewed for Stage 2B validation.

XIV. Overall Assessment of Data

The analysis was conducted within all specifications of the method. No results were rejected in this SDG.

Due to continuing calibration concentration, compounds reported as EMPC, CDPE interference, and results exceeding calibration range, data were qualified as estimated in four samples.

The quality control criteria reviewed, other than those discussed above, were met and are considered acceptable.

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

Sample	Compound	Flag	A or P	Reason
LDW20-IT302 LDW20-SC206 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311	1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	J (all detects)	P	Continuing calibration (concentration)
LDW20-IT302 LDW20-SC206 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and greater than the reporting limit.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-IT302 LDW20-SC206 LDW20-IT317 LDW20-IT311	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) and less than the reporting limit.	U (all non-detects)	A	Compound quantitation (EMPC)
LDW20-IT302	All results flagged "X" by the laboratory due to chlorinated diphenyl ether (CDPE) interference.	J (all detects)	A	Compound quantitation (CDPE interference)
LDW20-IT302	1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD OCDF OCDD	J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects) J (all detects)	P	Compound quantitation (exceeded range)

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Laboratory Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

Duwamish AOC4
Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans - Field Blank Data Qualification Summary - SDG 20I0239

No Sample Data Qualified in this SDG

LDC #: 49590G21 **VALIDATION COMPLETENESS WORKSHEET** Date: 11/9/20
SDG #: 20I0239 Stage 2B Page: 1 of 1
Laboratory: Analytical Resources, Inc. Reviewer:
2nd Reviewer: EC

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Polychlorinated Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

The samples listed below were reviewed for each of the following validation areas. Validation findings are noted in attached validation findings worksheets.

	Validation Area		Comments
I.	Sample receipt/Technical holding times	A	
II.	HRGC/HRMS Instrument performance check	A	
III.	Initial calibration/ICV	A/A	RSD≤20/%D. ICV≤ QC limits
IV.	Continuing calibration	A	CCV≤ QC limits
V.	Laboratory Blanks	A	
VI.	Field blanks	N	
VII.	Matrix spike/Matrix spike duplicates	N	CS
VIII.	Laboratory control samples /SRM	A/A	LCS
IX.	Field duplicates	N	
X.	Internal standards	A	
XI.	Compound quantitation RL/LOQ/LODs	A N	
XII.	Target compound identification	N	
XIII.	System performance	N	
XIV.	Overall assessment of data	A	

Note: A = Acceptable ND = No compounds detected D = Duplicate SB=Source blank
N = Not provided/applicable R = Rinsate TB = Trip blank OTHER:
SW = See worksheet FB = Field blank EB = Equipment blank

	Client ID	Lab ID	Matrix	Date
1	LDW20-IT302	20I0239-03	Sediment	06/22/20
2	LDW20-SC206	20I0239-08	Sediment	06/22/20
3	LDW20-IT317	20I0239-14	Sediment	06/23/20
4	LDW20-IT311	20I0239-15	Sediment	06/23/20
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				

Notes:

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

A. 2,3,7,8-TCDD	F. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDD	K. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDF	P. 1,2,3,4,7,8,9-HpCDF	U. Total HpCDD
B. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDD	G. OCDD	L. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDF	Q. OCDF	V. Total TCDF
C. 1,2,3,4,7,8-HxCDD	H. 2,3,7,8-TCDF	M. 2,3,4,6,7,8-HxCDF	R. Total TCDD	W. Total PeCDF
D. 1,2,3,6,7,8-HxCDD	I. 1,2,3,7,8-PeCDF	N. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDF	S. Total PeCDD	X. Total HxCDF
E. 1,2,3,7,8,9-HxCDD	J. 2,3,4,7,8-PeCDF	O. 1,2,3,4,6,7,8-HpCDF	T. Total HxCDD	Y. Total HpCDF

Notes:_____

LDC #: 49590421

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Continuing Calibration

Reviewer: 9

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)
Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

(Y) N N/A Was a continuing calibration performed at the beginning of each 12 hour period?
Y (N) N/A Were all concentrations within method QC limits for unlabeled and labeled compounds?
(Y) N N/A Did all continuing calibration standards meet the Ion Abundance Ratio criteria?

#	Date	Standard ID	Compound	conc (ng/mL) ~~Finding %D~~	Finding Ion Abundance Ratio	Associated Samples	Qualifications
	10/20/20	20102002	D	58.2 (45-55)		MB	J/UH/A
	10/20/20	20102016	K	57.3 (45-56)		All (dets)	J/UH/A

VALIDATION FINDINGS WOR/UHEET
Blanks

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins (EPA Method 1613B)

Blank extraction date: 10/14/20 **Blank analysis date:** 10/20/20
Conc. units: ng/kg **Associated samples:** All qual U

Compound	Blank ID	Sample Identification											
	BIJ0365-BLK1	5X											
F	0.280	1.4											
G	1.78	8.9											

LDC #: ~~19390421~~

VALIDATION FINDINGS WORKSHEET
Compound Quantitation and Reported RLs

Reviewer: PG

METHOD: HRGC/HRMS Dioxins/Dibenzofurans (EPA Method 1613B)

Please see qualifications below for all questions answered "N". Not applicable questions are identified as "N/A".

Y N N/A Were the correct labeled compound, quantitation ions and relative response factors (RRF) used to quantitate the compound?
Y N N/A Compound quantitation and RLs were adjusted to reflect all sample dilutions and dry weight factors (if necessary).

#	Date	Sample ID	Finding	Associated Samples	Qualifications
		All	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) > RL		Jdets/A
		~~All~~	All compounds reported as estimated maximum possible concentration (EMPC) < RL		U/A
		1	All compounds flagged "X" due to chlorinated diphenyl either interference		Jdets/A
		1	O, F, Q, 4 > calib range		~~Jdets~~/A

Comments: See sample calculation verification worksheet for recalculations